THEOLOGY

VOL. XXXVIII JUNE, 1939 No. 228

EDITORIAL

THE call for a bold Christian lead becomes increasingly and pitifully insistent. The insistence is pitiful both because of the circumstances which prompt it, and because of the extreme improbability of its being answered. It is calling for a miracle of no mean order. Let us not be unjust to the leaders of the Churches, nor try to bolster up our own desire for innocence or for safety by blaming their apparent ineffectiveness. If they had a lead to give of the fresh and striking kind that is desired, it is to be presumed that they would have given it before now. They would not have waited so long to take action which at this time of day would be not unfairly constructed as a reluctant concession to popular clamour. It is idle to call upon the Pope of Rome or the Archbishop of Canterbury to get us out of our troubles, if in the given situation it is not within their capacity to do so. Those who appeal to the Church leaders ought at least to explain in precise and concrete terms what they think ought to be done. But the appeals are always couched in vague or general terms, or else are hopelessly unrealistic. Until definite and practicable proposals for an ecclesiastical initiative are forthcoming, we conclude that the Church leaders are not unwilling, but unable to embark upon any such challenging action as would make an immediate difference to the international situation. The reasons for this inability are to be found in the modern apostasy not only of Europe, but of the Churches themselves, from the sovereign claims of God over the whole order of society.

* * * * *

Actually, appeals for a Christian lead commonly conceal confusion of thought between two distinct possibilities. While addressed to the Church leaders and apparently envisaging some general ecclesiastical action, they are appeals which could be answered only by men who stood in the succession of the Hebrew prophets. This succession

is no doubt apostolic, but in a different sense from that in which it is inherited by bishops and presbyteries. The mantle of the prophet seldom falls upon those who are already entitled to wear the triple-crown, the mitre, or even the Geneva gown. That the present occasion calls for the emergence of prophecy seems evident to us, but unfortunately prophets do not arise at the beckoning of men but by the inscrutable will of God. Nor do they appear when we most desire them, but when we least desire them. We can shelve our responsibility neither on to the Church leaders nor on to men who, if they exist, have not yet been moved by God to give us the lead which it may be His purpose that we should discover for ourselves.

* * * * *

More than one of the articles in this number illustrate and enforce the paramount need for a renewed and sustained attempt at Christian thinking on the part of individuals and in concert where concert is possible. This point was made by Professor Hodges too last month, and it may be, as he surmised, that " if even a corporate effort of Christian thought were now to be launched, . . . for the space of a generation such an effort would produce mainly negative results." If this be so, the effort will be all the more exacting, for we have a natural craving for " positive " and " constructive " results at once; but there must be no shrinking from the undertaking because it is going to prove arduous and for a long time not sensationally fruitful. The clergy may be dissatisfied with this proposal, because it will not immediately increase their congregations. Doctrinaire politicians dislike it, because it implies a refusal of their postulate that we are bound to choose between the ideologies of the Right and of the Left. Those who regard the pacifist issue as under present conditions the only vital one think that we shall get nowhere until we have agreed on that. And it is, of course, true that the outbreak of war would suspend and perhaps extinguish any corporate effort towards a Christian theology that had been launched. Nevertheless, the decision whether or not to take part in war and warlike preparations is a decision not between good and evil, but between two evils. To take part in war is manifestly diabolical, to refuse to take part is manifestly futile; both courses are intolerable, the one on religious, the other on political, grounds. Only those who accept a divorce

between religion and politics can follow either course with equanimity. Disagreement on the pacifist issue bears a truer witness than agreement would to the Christian refusal to accept this divorce.

* * * * *

There is not an abundance, but there is not a complete absence, of books which can be recommended to those who are willing to undertake the effort of thought which in the long run may make possible the giving of a new Christian lead. That possibility requires for its realization not only minds qualified to give a lead, but also a very much larger number qualified to respond to it. It follows that any Christians who now, whether individually or in groups or cells, devote themselves to this task will be actively, though not, of course, ostentatiously, preparing the way of such a regeneration of Christendom as is impossible under existing conditions. We have already more than once recommended M. Jacques Maritain's *True Humanism* which has been recognized by many Christians, who are neither French nor Roman Catholic, as a masterly adumbration of the task ahead. The writings of Dr Reinhold Niebuhr have a salutary and disconcerting effect in shaking the confidence of those who suppose that they already possess a quite satisfactory theory of the relation between Christianity and politics.[1] The new books by Mr Christopher Dawson, *Beyond Politics* (Sheed and Ward, 3s. 6d.), and by Mr Middleton Murry, *The Price of Leadership* (S.C.M. Press, 5s.), have the advantage that they are written with the conditions and opportunities that are peculiar to Great Britain specially in view.

* * * * *

None of these writers is an exponent of that reduced version of Christianity which was fashionable a generation ago; at the same time none is an intransigent traditionalist. With differences of background and idiom and emphasis they show their allegiance to the historic Christian faith, but they also show that the faith can survive in the West only if it is reintegrated with a social order and expressed in a living culture. The kingdom of God can never, of course, be consummated in this sinful world, and is not to

[1] There is a brief but interesting review of *True Humanism* by Dr Niebuhr in the Spring number of *Radical Religion* (p. 45).

be equated with utopian illusions; but the Church, which exists to witness to, and to be an earnest of, the kingdom, can never exist in a social vacuum. And in modern society less so than ever before. The mass-society, which the machine age has made possible, can be, and therefore will be, collectively controlled to a degree that has never before been feasible. Either it will be controlled by rulers who are inspired and guided and humbled by their allegiance to the kingdom of God, or else it will fall a ready victim to secularist power-politicians. Christians cannot in any case abdicate the claim of God to be sovereign over the whole social order, but in a modern society, even if they were willing to do this and to limit their claims to freedom of worship and association as a sect within a secularist state, they would be signing their death-warrant. The old despotisms were nothing to the new;[1] and this is not because the modern dictators are more evil or corruptible than the ancient, but because of the new power techniques which they have at their disposal and which are at the disposal of every government. Christians must either get control of these techniques and use them to better ends in so far as their use is tolerable at all, or else they will be destroyed by them.

* * * * *

That appears to be the inescapable choice with which we are confronted. If anyone denies that it is inescapable, let him show a way out. We must confess, and we are not surprised, that both Mr Dawson and Mr Murry are more successful in revealing the choice as ineluctable and urgent than in supplying definite guidance as to the means by which we may choose aright. At present we are drifting dangerously near the point beyond which there will be no real choice left. Some Christians believe that in fact that point has been already passed. They say that it is no longer within the power of Christians to influence the social

[1] *Cf.* Maritain, *Questions de conscience* (1938), p. 43: "Si forte qu'y fût l'oppression, les anciens despotismes s'exerçaient de la personne d'un roi sur les personnes et communautés de personnes dont se composait le royaume; dans la cité totalitaire d'aujourd'hui où trouver la personne humaine? Un Peuple qui n'est que Nombre, après avoir absorbé toutes choses dans son immanence et sa souveraineté, est absorbé lui-même dans un demi-dieu surgi de lui, en lequel il devient une personne—inhumaine."

order as a whole, and that we are hopelessly compromised and corrupted by our easy conformity. We ought therefore to go out of it and form small communities which by their manner of life would witness to the sovereignty of God in a world that has rejected it. It is a mistake to treat this counsel as childish; in the end we may be driven to follow it. Both Mr Dawson and Mr Murry recognize this. But there is an important difference between being driven into the wilderness when it has finally become clear that no other course is open, and voluntarily retiring there before the issues have been fully raised. We do not doubt that the special vocation to go thus apart comes to some Christians in every generation; but the present suggestion is that in this generation it is the normal vocation for all Christians. Even if to act upon it were practicable, would it not be equivalent to a voluntary abdication of the sovereignty of God over the whole social order? If Christians are to become a dispersed remnant, it will be as a consequence of, not as a prelude to, persecution.

The Policy of Pius XI

Fides Intrepida is the title applied to Pius XI in the Prophecy of St Malachy, and certainly the pope whose reign covered the last seventeen years had need of great faith. The scientific and mechanical changes of the last century, the remodelling of the European states-system after the war, have been followed by an even greater change, the rise of totalitarianism. Christianity and civilization are not interchangeable terms, they have different and often conflicting standards of value, but they are at one in emphasizing the reality and importance of the individual; whether he should achieve fulfilment in this life or in the next, they are agreed that it is his personality that matters. This is the humanist tradition of 3000 years, and it is now challenged by the totalitarian ideal which is prepared to sacrifice the individual, not even for his own ultimate good, but for that of the group or of the nation. Such an ideal cuts deeper at the root of Christianity than any previous attack. Future generations will judge Pius XI according to his success or failure in meeting that menace.

Elected pope (February 6, 1922) after a four-days conclave, Achille Ratti was almost unknown to the great majority in Italy and abroad. It was only eight months before that he had been made a cardinal and appointed Archbishop of Milan. But his previous life, though it had not brought him popular fame, had given him a solid reputation in curiously diverse circles. To the learned world he was known as a competent scholar and a great librarian, who had administered the Ambrosiana and the Vatican with signal success. Mountaineers knew him as a climber of courage and endurance, who had been a member of the first party to make the almost impossible ascent of Monte Rosa from the Italian side. More recently diplomats had heard of him as Apostolic Visitor and Nuncio to Poland, where he had admirably handled the many difficult situations arising in the first three years of the country's existence; especially had he shown great skill in dealing with the thorny question of the Upper Silesian plebiscite and great courage in remaining in Warsaw during the Russian advance of 1920.

What was to be expected of a pope with such qualities? At the time of his election, many people thought that he

would prove a liberalizing force in the Vatican: they overlooked the significance of his choice of the name Pius, linking his policy with that of Pius IX and Pius X. But though never a liberal, he showed himself a man of forceful personality, a modernizer in all material things, and animated by a sincere desire for peace. His first encyclical, *Ubi Arcano* (December 24, 1922), laid down the principles which he repeated again and again: the absence of true peace in the world, the necessity for international and social justice, the prime importance of religion for the individual and for the state. *Pax Christi in Regno Christi.* This was the motto of his reign, and it was towards the extension of the Reign of Christ—that is to say, the conversion of all men to Roman Catholicism and the organization of the social and political order of all states in accordance with papal doctrine—that all his acts were directed.[1]

It was in Italy that his policy met with the greatest success. The conclusion of the Lateran Treaty was the central event of his pontificate. It put an end to the situation which had kept the Vatican and the Quirinal estranged for fifty-nine years and had imposed an extremely difficult problem of divided allegiance upon the conscience of all Italian Catholics.

After the annexation of Rome by the Kingdom of Italy in 1870, the popes had retired entirely into the Vatican; seldom were they seen in St Peter's, never in the Piazza or the city. Protesting against the injustice of the act and claiming the restoration of the temporal power, they refused to accept the Law of Guarantees voted by the Italian Parliament in 1871, which promised them complete independence and a yearly income of 3,250,000 lire. The Italian court was laid under an interdict, Catholic sovereigns who visited the Quirinal were not received at the Vatican, and Italian Catholics were forbidden to take any part in political life. Of course numerous relations between Church and State did in actual fact exist. In many parts of Italy

[1] The most useful biographies of Pius XI are those by D. Gwynn (1932), P. Hughes (1937) and Mgr R. Fontenelle (1938). But to get the various views on complicated questions, such as the Lateran Treaty and the *Action Française* condemnation, it is necessary to have recourse to the copious literature in French and Italian. W. Teeling, *The Pope in Politics* (1937), is an indictment by an Irish Catholic who has " faith in the future of democracy." *Pope Pius XI and World Peace*, by Lord Clonmore (1937), is apparently intended as a reply to it.

bishops were appointed by royal nomination, in all the royal *Exequatur* was necessary before they could take possession of their sees. Unofficially consultation took place between the authorities, and outside the old Papal States relations between the clergy and civil authorities were often cordial. Gradually the Vatican spoke less of the restoration of the temporal power and more of an international guarantee of papal independence. The prohibition on Catholics taking part in politics, the veto on Catholic sovereigns visiting Rome, the interdict on the Cappella Paolina in the Quirinal were successively raised; and Pius XI after his election gave his blessing *Urbi et Orbi* from the external balcony of St Peter's.

A *modus vivendi* had been reached, but it was difficult to see how any permanent settlement could be made which would satisfy both parties. A few months after the beginning of the pope's reign the situation was changed by the advent of Fascism. An ex-socialist, whose bellicose attitude had caused him to break with the party in 1914, Mussolini had remained a militant anti-clerical, and in the years of its growth Fascism was as much opposed to the Church as to democracy. But after 1922 the Fascist party increasingly needed the support of conservative and Catholic elements to maintain itself in power. Numerous marks of favour were paid to the Church, and it was known that cordial relations existed between them. Nevertheless, the secret of the three years' negotiations was so well kept that the news of the signing of the treaty (February 11, 1929) came as a complete surprise.

By this treaty the pope recognized as irrevocable the incorporation of Rome and the Papal States into the Kingdom of Italy. In return the temporal power was restored, not in the form of the old Papal States nor even of the Leonine City as had sometimes been suggested both before and after 1870. A new territory was created under the title of the Vatican City[1] over which the pope enjoyed full

[1] The Vatican City consists of the Vatican and its gardens, St Peter's and the Piazza—108 acres in all. The basilicas of St John Lateran, Santa Maria Maggiori, and San Paolo fuori le Mura, certain papal offices in Rome, the papal palace at Castel Gandolfo (to which was added the newly acquired Villa Barberini), and a considerable tract of land on the northern slopes of the Janiculum are recognized as papal property with rights of extraterritoriality, but apparently do not form part of the Vatican City.

sovereignty. In addition he received a total payment of 1,750,000,000 lire (a large amount, but considerably less than the accumulated sum that would have been due to him under the Law of Guarantees).

Closely associated with the treaty was the Italian Concordat. This contained an elaborate settlement of administrative questions and went far beyond the concessions which other states had been prepared to make. Not merely was the pope given complete freedom in the choice of bishops, but privileges were given to the clergy and to religious associations; religious education was established in the elementary and secondary schools and all questions concerning marriage were handed over to the ecclesiastical courts. Well might the pope describe it as a " Concordat which, if not actually the very best possible, is certainly to be reckoned among the best " (address to the professors and students of the Catholic University of Milan, February 13, 1929).

In Italy the conclusion of the treaty was hailed with almost universal satisfaction, but abroad doubts were expressed upon two points. Would the treaty, in fact, make the papacy more or less dependent on Italy than in the past? Why, after so long rejecting the Law of Guarantees and demanding an international agreement, had the pope now accepted a simple treaty with Italy?

The answers given to the latter question turned largely upon a technical question of international law. The Law of Guarantees had attributed to the papacy personal inviolability, full control of the Vatican and other palaces, and all the outward marks of sovereignty, but had not actually declared him sovereign. For the pope to be recognized in international law as a sovereign he must have some territory, however small, which was now provided by the Vatican City. Whereas the Italian State had previously promulgated a law (which presumably it might later repeal), now it negotiated a treaty; *i.e.*, it did not claim to be conferring a favour upon the pope, it was recognizing his existing rights and merely settling details. If it was pointed out that the papacy would, in fact, have refused any such negotiations in 1870 even if they had been made, it was replied that the difference lay in the character of the government; then it was anti-clerical, now it had shown itself favourable to the Church. Moreover, there was the concordat, which was closely bound up with the treaty. It was the treaty which recognized Roman Catholicism

as the state religion of Italy, the concordat which dealt with the sacred character of the city of Rome. It would be difficult for any future Italian government to abolish the concordat without breaking the treaty and reopening the whole Roman question—a thing which any government would hesitate to do. So far as possible the pope had ensured that Italy would remain a Catholic state.

The real question, however, was the safeguarding of the international character of the papacy. The main argument in favour of the temporal power had always been that possession of an independent territory was necessary for unfettered action. Critics might doubt whether this was historically true, and wonder whether a landless pope, a "prisoner in the Vatican," with nothing to lose at law, but safeguarded by the public opinion of the world, was not in actual fact more independent, less enmeshed in diplomacy and less subject to fear, than the owner of a small state surrounded by a powerful neighbour. Would not the creation of the Vatican City bind the papacy more closely than ever to Italy?

It is still too early to give a full answer to this question, but it is undoubtedly true that during the following years papal policy seemed to become more and more Italian.[1] At one time hopes were entertained that the pope intended to break the old tradition whereby a majority of cardinals were Italians. During his middle years he was so sparing in the creation of cardinals that by the beginning of 1935 the Sacred College had dropped from its full complement of seventy members to fifty-three, of whom only twenty-six were Italians. It was surmised that he was waiting for a favourable moment to create foreign cardinals and change the balance. Later in the year at a consistory (December 16, 1935), he created twenty cardinals, of whom fourteen were Italian. Coming at the height of the Abyssinian crisis, this was held to show that the pope had never really had any

[1] Mr Teeling (*op. cit.*, p. 125) points out that the financial provisions of the Lateran Treaty freed the pope from dependence on America but gave him instead a financial interest in the stability of the Fascist régime in Italy, since more than half of the indemnity was in state bonds. To this it must be added that he also had a moral interest in the continuance of Fascism; gratitude for the Lateran Treaty threw the whole weight of the Italian clergy and Catholic laity on the side of Mussolini, and once the causes were thus solidarized, any alternative régime would be anti-clerical and anti-papal to a far greater degree than before 1922.

intention of modifying the essentially Italian character of the Vatican.

Support for the same view might perhaps be found in the pope's own declaration that it was "in the Concordat that the Treaty finds not only its explanation, not only its justification, but its recommendation as well" (address of February 13, 1929)—a statement which suggested a willingness to sacrifice the interests of the Universal Church represented by the treaty to those of Catholicism in Italy represented by the concordat. And six years later, one line of defence[1] put forward for his failure to protest against the Italian invasion of Abyssinia seemed to show that the treaty had failed to secure its primary purpose.

The Lateran Treaty is the watershed of the pontificate. During the previous years Pius XI seemed to favour democracy and internationalism; later, though he continued to make appeals for international appeasement, he was frequently accused of Fascist bias.[2] Italian by birth, by temperament and by sympathy, he undoubtedly looked with favour upon the Fascist régime in Italy, but it was not that favour which was the mainspring of his policy. Nor can the change be attributed to the retirement (February 7, 1930) of Cardinal Gasparri, the francophil Secretary of State, to be succeeded by Cardinal Pacelli, a former Nuncio in Berlin and brother of the principal papal agent in the negotiation of the treaty. Pius XI was always master of his own policy, and it was a consistent policy; the change was one of means and not of objects.

All who have studied Pius XI are agreed that the years in Warsaw exercised a profound effect upon him and taught him to regard communism as above all the enemy. This fear was naturally increased by the persecution of the Church in Russia, and later in Mexico and Spain. His aim in

[1] "What can the Pope do to prevent this or any other war? He is a helpless old man with a small police force to guard himself, to guard the priceless treasures of the Vatican, and to protect his diminutive state, which ensures his due independence in the exercise of his universal right and duty to teach and to guide his followers of all races. Can he denounce a neighbouring Power—a Power armed with absolute control of everything and with every modern instrument of force?" (Archbishop Hinsley, as reported in *The Times*, October 14, 1935).

[2] The estrangement between Vatican and Quirinal had been the best assurance to the world that an Italian pope was not under Italian influence; when the breach was healed, it was inevitable that such accusations should be made.

keeping on good terms with all other European governments was not purely domestic; he wished to unite the West, perhaps in a crusade against Russia, certainly in a common defence against communism. During the twenties liberal democracy (largely ignorant of communism) was in the ascendant, and it seemed as though the League of Nations might provide the common basis; during the thirties totalitarianism arose (consciously appealing to anti-communist sentiment), and it was on the totalitarian states that he based his policy. To overlook either period leads to a complete misunderstanding of his real aims.

In the first period the centre of interest lay in France. The anti-clerical measures of the beginning of the century had left the Church without legal status, the religious orders prohibited, and an atmosphere of mutual bitterness and suspicion. The anti-modernist campaign which followed was closely associated with hostility to the Republic. The war did much to heal the breach; the nationalistic attitude of the French Church removed any doubts of its patriotism, though the papacy was often accused of being pro-German. When Pius XI succeeded, diplomatic relations had already been re-established, and early in his reign he approved (January 18, 1924) the formation of *associations diocesaines*, which carried out some of the provisions of the law of 1905 and gave the Church a means of holding property. The pope was unpopular with certain sections of the French Right for expressing disapproval of the occupation of the Ruhr, and again for his manifest support of the pacific policy of Briand. It was to the cordial relations between the Vatican and the French government that the condemnation of the *Action Française* was generally attributed.

The *Action Française* was more than merely a royalist and nationalist movement; it was based on a philosophy of life, largely derived from traditional Catholic sociology. Its leader, Charles Maurras, was not a Catholic, though he supported the Church as a force for order in the State. Politically unimportant, the *Action Française* was influential in many circles—students because of its vigorous attacks upon established institutions, the aristocracy because of its royalism, Catholic intellectuals because of its neo-scholastic philosophy, many of the higher clergy because it had undoubtedly been favoured by Rome in the time of Pius X. In the autumn of 1926 it was condemned, first by the Archbishop of Bordeaux, and then by the pope; the newspaper

was placed upon the Index and Catholics were forbidden to read it or to belong to any of its organizations. The grounds given for this condemnation were not the violent and unchristian tone of the newspaper, but theological errors in its doctrine. Into the acrimonious controversy which followed it is unnecessary to enter. Many who did not sympathize with the tone or policy of the *Action Française* felt that the papal action was unjustified and constituted an interference in the political sphere. Gradually the clergy were all forced to renounce the *Action Française*, but many of the laity refused to do so. Harsh measures were taken against them; unless they publicly recanted they were refused the sacraments and even Christian burial. When Briand died in 1932 French Catholics could not help comparing the elaborate religious service accorded him, a life-long anti-clerical who had been formally excommunicated for his share in the Separation, with the refusal of the offices of a priest to devoted Catholics whose only fault was that they had refused to renounce their political allegiance.

Many explanations disparaging to the pope were put forward to account for the condemnation, but it is sufficient to suppose that it was done in order to improve the relations of Church and State. The *Action Française* was continually representing itself as the Catholic party, thereby causing the Church to be identified with reaction and chauvinism. Only by a radical disavowal could the dissociation be made clear. To condemn it would please the government, conciliate democratic opinion, and contribute to European appeasement. There may also have been a desire to uproot the last remnants of an independent Gallicanism in France; the *Action Française* proclaimed its devotion to Rome and its ultramontane orthodoxy, but it was very definitely a lay movement. The effect, however, was precisely the opposite. The papal action was resented in France and attributed to German and Italian influences at the Vatican hostile to French Nationalism. As a result French Catholicism has become more Gallican in spirit than at any time since 1870.

In Germany during these years the Church was at the height of its power. The Catholic Centre Party held the balance in the Reichstag and, with the Social-Democrats, participated in every government during the life of the Weimar Republic. The Church was disestablished, but favourable concordats were concluded with Bavaria, Prussia and Baden. The Centre was definitely a political

party, with a full political program and a lay organization; though thoroughly Catholic in spirit, it was not under immediate ecclesiastical control. After the advent of the Nazis, the pope was not perhaps altogether sorry to order its dissolution, as he had in similar circumstances dissolved the Partito Popolare in Italy; another possible nucleus of independent organization in the Church was gone. The Centre and the German bishops had been strongly opposed to the Nazi movement, though after Hitler came to power they had to support him, lest they gave an excuse for rousing opinion against the Church as an anti-national body. But the pope seems to have welcomed the new régime, seeing in it a better bulwark against communism, and the promise of a new concordat. It is true that the Nazis had never concealed that in their opinion Rome was second only to Moscow—it was the Black International which had destroyed the First Reich of the Middle Ages—but the pope may have reflected that Fascism, too, had been anti-clerical at first and had come round to support the Church and make the Lateran agreements. It looked as though this was to prove a true calculation; within six months a new concordat had been concluded with the now unified Reich.

The conclusion of concordats with various states has been the keynote of modern papal policy. In the Middle Ages, popes dictated to kings and emperors, but in the sixteenth century they began to make treaties as and when they could. Virtually abandoning the claim to be the moral arbiter or the supreme overlord of the world, they became the guardians of ecclesiastical interests. These concordats mostly turned upon methods of appointing bishops, promulgation of papal bulls, and settlement of the revenues of the Church; generally the king was given the right to nominate bishops subject to papal confirmation, and careful rules were laid down how much money might be sent to Rome, or, in the nineteenth century, when church estates had been nationalized, how much revenue was to be paid annually by the State to the Church. By 1914, these concordats had almost disappeared; in most countries the Church had been disestablished, the state payments suppressed, the election of bishops wholly in the hands of Rome. It seemed as though, in one country after another, the Church would become a voluntary society.

After the war there was a change of policy. The older anti-clericalism was dying, the power of the Church in-

creasing, and governments were anxious to keep on good terms with it. On his side the pope was anxious to consolidate the position, and Pius XI concluded no fewer than twenty concordats or other treaties. They differ from the older concordats, because there is no question of dividing control over the Church, which is now completely free—*i.e.*, completely subject to Rome—and financial provisions occupy a much smaller space. Their main preoccupation is to secure freedom of action for the Church, and above all to ensure religious education for the children.

The policy of concordats is one means of extending the Reign of Christ. Another is Catholic Action. Its institution may be dated from the encyclical *Quas primas* (December 11, 1925) establishing the feast of Christ the King, but it was not till three years later that an explicit formulation was given in the Letter to Cardinal Bertram (November 18, 1928). There it is defined as " the participation of the laity in the apostolate of the hierarchy." It is the co-ordination of the activities of all Catholic societies, the association of the laity in the work of the Church, not only for the promotion of individual religion but for the transformation of society. Admirable as these ideals may be, they have aroused intense opposition from the governments of Italy and Germany, and have been criticized by all those, whether Catholics or not, who cannot wholly accept the ultramontane conception of the Reign of Christ. Catholic Action differs in two ways from the older Catholic parties to which it has in effect succeeded. It is expressly debarred from party politics, and for that reason it may become an even more powerful political force, since it may hope to marshal an almost united Catholic vote on any issue which the pope declares to be not political but religious. It is a movement for the laity, but its cardinal principle is that it must in all its actions be subject to the control of the diocesan bishop; the older parties with their lay leaders might occasionally display tendencies independent of Rome. Catholic Action represents a further stage in the evolution of ultramontanism.

For many years the pope's policy seemed successful, but the last five years were clouded with increasing trouble. Even in 1933 relations were strained between Catholics and Nazis in Germany; no word of protest was heard against the persecution of Jews and liberals and socialists, but denunciation of the errors of racialism in the Church and complaints at the closing of Catholic schools. In 1934

trouble began in Austria (with Portugal and Eire the most papal states in Europe); Dollfüss, who had declared his intention of making Austria into a Catholic corporative state with a semi-fascist constitution based on the papal encyclicals, was murdered by Nazis. Relations with Germany became steadily worse, and in the autumn of 1935 the Abyssinian crisis placed the pope in a peculiarly awkward position. Disappointment was felt throughout the world that he failed to make a stand against Italian aggression. His defenders pointed out that there was more in the Italian case than public opinion was prepared to allow, that by the Lateran Treaty the pope had agreed not to intervene in temporal disputes between states, and that he might jeopardize the position of the Church in Italy without affording any relief to the Abyssinians. Such explanations, however, failed to remove the impression that the pope had lost a great opportunity; expediency had conquered justice, local interests had proved more powerful than universal. Both in Italy and Germany he seemed to have shown himself the departmental leader of the Roman Church, and not (as his followers love to describe him) the highest moral authority in the world.

Later there was a revival of sympathy. In December, 1936, he was attacked by severe illness, and the remarkable endurance which prolonged his life for twenty-six months won him universal respect. As his policy fell into ruins, so his utterances became clearer and more impressive. The encyclical *Mit brennender Sorge* (March 14, 1937) contained a clear denunciation of the religious ideals and policy of the Nazis (to prove impartiality it was accompanied five days later by another encyclical condemning Atheistic Communism), and when Italy adopted the doctrine of racialism (July, 1938) he did not hesitate to speak out against it. His action during the September crisis, when he offered his life to God for the peace of the world, touched the imagination, and at the time of his death (February 10, 1939) his popularity as a moral leader was at its height.

Little space is left for the consideration of other aspects of Pius XI's reign. It was marked by a great growth of missionary activity and great endeavours to secure reunion with the east. There has been a great increase in the number of missionary dioceses and the pope himself consecrated the first native bishops for India, China and Japan. Holding aloof from the conferences at Stockholm and Lausanne

and guarded in his attitude towards the Malines conversations, he hoped that the Eastern Church in her hour of need might accept the succour of Rome. To this end he sent a relief mission to Russia in 1922-24, encouraged the Uniat Churches, and founded in Rome the Russian Seminary and the Pontifical Institute of Oriental Studies. Sixteen ceremonies of canonization were held in St Peter's and numerous beatifications.[1] In his later years all wondered at the zest he seemed to have for long and tiring ceremonies. Three times he celebrated a Holy Year—the normal Jubilee of 1925, his Sacerdotal Jubilee in 1929, and the centenary of the Crucifixion in 1933. On these, as well as on other occasions, thousands of pilgrims flocked to Rome. Apart from their religious value, they were good propaganda, keeping the Church in the forefront of the news; they were also good business, and as such were highly popular with the hotel-keepers of Rome and with the Fascist government.

Pius XI constantly showed that he had no fear of modern innovations and welcomed every appliance which improved efficiency. The years following the Lateran Treaty saw great activity in Rome; perhaps no pope since Urban VIII has left his arms upon so many buildings. The new Propaganda College on the Janiculum, the Jesuit headquarters in the Borgo S. Spirito, and the Gregorian University in the Piazza Pilotta are the most prominent in Rome, while within the Vatican City the railway station, Governor's Palace, and Ethiopian Seminary are prominent. At Castel Gandolfo the papal palace was restored and used as a summer residence during the last five years of his life, magnificent gardens were laid out, and a model farm established. The Vatican was equipped with every modern convenience, and from the new wireless station the pope broadcast messages to the world. The Vatican Library was reorganized and rebuilt after the disastrous collapse in 1931, and a much needed improvement carried out by the building of a new Pinacotheca where the pictures could

[1] Englishmen will remember with gratitude the canonization of More and Fisher. Among those whom Pius XI both beatified and canonized may be mentioned the Jesuit theologian Cardinal Bellarmine, John Bosco founder of the Salesians, Bernadette Soubirous who saw the vision at Lourdes, and Sœur Therèse de l'Enfant Jésus. He also proclaimed four new Doctors of the Church—Albertus Magnus, Peter Canisius, Cardinal Bellarmine, and St John of the Cross.

be properly displayed. The style employed in these buildings did not escape criticism on the grounds of a pseudo-modernity, but it cannot be denied that they are fully accordant with the spirit of Fascist architecture, and have played their part in the recent transformation which has replaced medieval and papal Rome by a modern city of broad streets, huge buildings and classical ruins.

What judgment will posterity pass upon this reign? Pius XI will not be forgotten: he has impressed himself upon too many spheres. Beyond this, all is hazardous conjecture. One may surmise that he will not appear as a great leader or a source of inspiration; he had neither the literary gifts and intellectual subtlety of Leo XIII nor the personal charm and saintliness of Pius X. Strength of will impressed itself on all who met him as the dominating trait of his character, but his early training had made him a man of routine, and, though conscientious, well-informed and forceful, he never really succeeded in dominating the larger situation. To say that he was a political pope is no disparagement—so long as the Church exists as a society among men, politics will be necessary—but it means that his reputation will depend upon the ultimate outcome of his policy, which cannot yet be foreseen. If the totalitarian states succeed, Pius XI will appear in history as a wise diplomatist who steered the Church through difficult years. If they collapse, they will be succeeded by anti-clerical governments, and he will appear as the evil genius who allied the Church with reaction and brought upon it a heavy load of future trouble.

R. E. Balfour.

Prayer and Theology

Prayer is the life of theology. It is not only a part of theological knowledge but is the end or purpose of theological inquiry. Without prayer, which is the living practice of the knowledge of God, no branch of theological study can be anything better than a barren exercise.

Prayer is both the means and the end of the purpose of human being: namely, it is the means of free and conscious intercourse between the creature and his Creator and it expresses the union between the two. It is the art of spiritual

living and is necessarily served and supported by the exact studies of the appropriate divisions of theology.

Dogmatic theology provides the intellectual groundwork for appreciating divine truth, so that prayer is informed and grows in knowledge. Moral theology sets out the necessary discipline to control and redirect the human frailty, that it may be free to turn its attention Godward and find in humble penitence its only true and fruitful approach to the Divine Majesty. Ascetic theology gathers up the experience of the past and marks the way of the soul's development in the art of prayer itself through the three stages of purgation, illumination and union. Mystical theology describes the state of the exemplars of the " experimental knowledge of divine things (or realities) produced supernaturally by God in the soul "[1] which for no merit of man's, but through the divine will and action, is granted to some few in this life.

It is advantageous in a short article to restrict the treatment to a few broad foundation principles which are often missed because the interest is concentrated on the excellence of some particular tree of method or flower of devotion. If prayer is the art of spiritual living, it will be incomplete if it includes only the art of the practice of the presence of God without the necessary complement of the practice of the presence of man.

The humanism springing from the Renaissance re-discovery of the individual, because it lacked a theological centre which alone could preserve the synthesis of man with man, has with every increase of man's knowledge and power over the material universe tended to break the social pattern and isolate the individual. The most pressing need today, both social and religious, is to re-discover man's place in a social organism. The tragedy of the modern world is that the one society which has the supreme message of collective living—namely, the Church of Christ—seems to be fighting a not too successful rearguard action against the forces of the new and rival collective ideologies which bestride the world and whose conflict may easily destroy our present civilization and bring in a new dark age. " Modern religion has become merely a department of culture, with a special place reserved for it—a very small one."[2] To recognize this fact is to be neither pessimistic nor defeatist, for unless

[1] Teresian Congress, 1923. [2] Berdyaev, *The End of Our Time.*

it *is* recognized Christian prayer must be largely irrelevant to the Christian circumstance and an escape from the true conflict to which Christ is calling the members of His Body. "Ye ask and receive not, because ye ask amiss."

Christianity is not an ideology somewhat better than others or even to be accepted because revealed by God, but it is a life of salvation with an urgency to convert and bring the whole world to its way of living. It can never be on the defensive, for it is an expression of the power of the Spirit fulfilling and renewing life, and is made triumphant through the inexhaustible power of prayer. We need to recover, if we are to be adequate to our time, the theology of prayer both in relation to man's duty to God and also to his duty to his neighbour wherein the power of the Spirit released by faith may transform and change, not only the lives of those who pray, but also the lives and living of those who are prayed for.

As theology had to find in the fulness of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity a complete and ethical self-giving so that, as Taylor expresses it, the definition should utterly exclude any possibility of postulating a "core of self-centredness" or allowing that "in its foundations the divine life must be egoistic,"[1] so in describing prayer the same insistence on the ethical and self-giving must be made. "For their sakes I sanctify myself."

There is this distinction between the divine pattern and the soul created in His image, that in God there is essential love and in man love is derived from God. "We love Him because He first loved us." The growth of love in the human soul is due to the action of God and not to the special activity of man. We co-operate with the divine love, and it is expressed in us not only Godward but also manward.

In prayer the individual fulfils his personality by the losing of his own self-centred life and finds himself in the relationship of love, not only with one part of his total experience, even though that part be his Creator, but with every part. If he did not, his self-giving would be illusory and he would still preserve in himself a hard core of selfishness and self-centredness in respect of his neighbour. In the modern setting of subjective thinking the classical definition of prayer by St John Damascene, "the lifting up of the mind to God," needs complementing to protect it from any idea that the

[1] A. E. Taylor, *The Faith of a Moralist*, i. 249.

human soul is the originating source of that uplifting or that it is complete in a terrible isolation of the individual in his own place and God in His place. The life of heaven which is all prayer is the life of the family; a perfect flow and re-flow of the awareness of the unity and harmonious distinction of each several part dependent upon the all-sufficient Source of living, wherein, as Dante depicts it in the Paradiso, each separate flame is but one fire. Prayer should be considered as an unfolding as well as an uplifting, and it is also an expansion into a widening circle of relationship. An analogy may be taken for the first, though not, of course, pressed too far, from nature. The rosebud has within it its own potential forces of expansion formed by the previous action of the sun's warmth upon the plant, yet it will not unfold till it itself responds to the sun's warmth upon it. It opens to the sun because it is in the warmth of the sun. So with the soul. Within it are the potential powers of grace and life given by God. And it opens towards God, or uplifts its mind, because God is there already and it is in the warmth of the divine love. The life of prayer is an unfolding in relationship. It differs from the natural analogy because the human soul is free to refuse to unfold or to make only a partial response; to keep its life and so to lose it.

Man is created a member of society and no operation of his life can be separated from that fact, least of all his religion. " Every virtue is obtained by means of thy neighbour, and likewise every defect."[1] Prayer may be fittingly described as the art of self-loss and self-discovery in relation to God and man. The development of the human character and personality depends on the interaction of the individual centre of life in relation to its neighbours relating each contact and relationship to the central relationship in God. The breaking of this unity, in and through the self-possessiveness of sin, is what makes prayer difficult. Ideally prayer should be as easy as breathing, but it is not, through the core of self-love which breaks the unity of man with God and man with man. It is " self-love which destroys charity and affection towards the neighbour that is the principle and foundation of every evil," writes St Catherine of Siena, and relates our Lord saying to her, " All scandals, hatred, cruelty and every sort of trouble proceed from this perverse

[1] St Catherine of Siena: *Dialogues*.

root of self-love which has poisoned the entire world and weakened the mystical body of the holy Church and the universal body of the believers in the Christian religion; and therefore I said to thee that it was in the neighbour, that is to say in the love of him, that all virtues were founded; and truly indeed did I say to thee that charity gives life to all the virtues because no virtue can be obtained without charity which is the pure love of Me."[1]

Here we find expressed the need for a complete relationship of self-giving or charity between the soul and all that makes up its neighbourliness, and that the ground of its possibility is the fact of the increasing love for God. It is most important that this should be emphasized at the present time because of the tendency to-day for the spiritual exercise of prayer to be regarded as of compensation value in a life of individual self-expression, harassed and burdened by the complexities and pressures of modern life, and not as the one sufficient power to co-ordinate and re-combine the broken pattern of human life. It is only when prayer is brought back to its true position as the integrating power of human life both Godward and manward that it will become intelligible and ethically practicable.

Many people are kept away from giving themselves to prayer because of unresolved mental difficulties as to the ethical sincerity of the practice of prayer as they find it expressed in the life of the churches around them. One of the most common misunderstandings of the nature of prayer is to think of it as being egoistic. No doubt it often is, and the failure of Christians to live up to their vocation is a cause of stumbling. There is also much that passes for prayer in heathenism that is a perversion of the truth and tends to become magical rather than religious—incantations to compel the unseen powers to act in ways agreeable to the desires of the human ego. Such misunderstandings, and others, come from a failure to appreciate that prayer is the operation of an ethical relationship, of the dependence of the creature upon the Creator, and the interdependence of the creaturely life in all its parts. Prayer is truly the uplifting of the mind to God, but it is for a purpose, the accomplishment of His will in integrating the life of His creation through the willing surrender of free co-operation by His creatures. It is not a substitute for action, but the

[1] St Catherine of Siena: *Dialogues.*

stimulus for action. It is not a convenient means of passing those issues of life to God which men are afraid of or unwilling to face, but the dedication of men to God to face and conquer them with God.

The foundation of all prayer is dependence upon the Divine Person and the divine will. This should not be difficult for anybody to understand, nor need it imply any great intellectual capacity for its performance. In short, it is the intention that is of primary importance: the intention to be selfless and so in full moral union with God and man.

The problem to-day is neighbourliness. It was easy to realize in a simpler age when the contacts between men were direct and obvious, provoking an immediate emotional reaction. For example, St John of God could walk the streets of the town calling to the faithful " to do good to their own souls," by giving their alms and broken meat for the support of his hospital. To-day the hospital system is so vast and so universal that it is rapidly becoming a charge on the community as a whole and not an outlet for individual charity. It is hard for the Christian to recognize his responsibility in exercising the works of mercy through paying rates. In the world of to-day social relationships have become so highly complex that there is little or no immediate contact either to stimulate intellectual understanding of the conditions of other men's lives, or to evoke the emotion of pity in regard to their needs: out of sight out of mind, and, even more, out of charity. Pity, as a cynical observer on modern life phrases it, has evaporated in the no-man's-land of the struggle of economic and national supremacy. If pity were the only ground for intercession, then indeed there would be little or no hope of a coming spiritual revival. Thank God, it is not. The ground of intercession is relationship both to God and man: " If ye have done it to the least of these My brethren ye have done it unto Me." Behind all human suffering stands our Lord's broken heart.

We have to learn to-day to think collectively in our devotion and in our service. If you pray for the remedying of social conditions, you must be prepared to take your part in paying higher taxes for community services, which is the equivalent to-day for much that in the past would have been personal charity—the giving of the second coat.

To make prayer a reality is to pray about practical things—the practical things that touch life—and to see and

feel behind the material contacts the true relationship between each member of the community. Prayer, if it is to be fruitful not only in its wider results, but also for the development and satisfaction of the individual praying, must be characterized by this ethical fulness which is the expression and experience of charity. To keep the commandments the neighbour must be loved as one's self, and it is that " having " and " keeping "[1] which is the ground of the promise of the knowledge of and union with God.

The attempt to separate the spiritual from the material and social does not simplify the problem for the individual, for it weakens his perception of reality, darkens counsel, and inevitably produces dryness of soul and often in the end lack of faith. This attitude may, indeed, induce a temporary sense of security for fixed adolescents, who refuse to grow up, by allowing them to specialize in piety, so that straining after a gnat of devotion they succeed in swallowing a camel of spiritual egotism. They multiply methods and devise new emotional goads to their own ultimate confusion and to the deterrence of those who would fain find God in prayer and who draw back because of the extreme complexity of the way set before them.

Each of the great divisions of the activity of prayer, to be complete, has to be founded upon two realities: the fact that the creature is a creature; and that the creature is in sin, and as long as he is in this life falls short of the perfection to which God may be leading him, " for sin always lurks in some recess of man's soul."[2]

Worship, which is the first need of the creature Godward, is difficult just because it comprises the effort of turning Godward the dissociated will that is subjected to vanity. It is also difficult because of the fact of sin: because the self is egoistic and has bound itself to so many loves which are not the love of God, and therefore there is a state of tension and a terrible incompleteness. The difficulty in worship is not, as is so often thought, an intellectual one; deep thoughts and profound ideas about God are not a necessary preliminary. God will disclose Himself as He will to those who worship Him. What is true here, however, is that the human mind is so constituted that, unless it has some ideas, it cannot maintain the attention or control the interest and it needs an emotional focus to quicken the desire. God in His

[1] St John xiv, 21 *et seq.*

[2] Macarius, *Hermit of Egypt.*

mercy has provided for the Christian all that is necessary in the Person of the Saviour, whose character as the revelation of God is clearly delineated in the gospels and in the history of His saints.

The same things are the difficulties in thanksgiving. There is no question that thanksgiving is the most difficult part of the prayer life to most people. They can understand worship because even if there is in them not much of the fear of the Lord, in the sense of awe, there is at least a fair measure of the terror of the Lord in the sense of fear. With thanksgiving, unless there is a very lively sense, first, of the fact that except for grace they will perish, and also of a real contrition that provides a present sense of judgment and recognizes that the soul is worthy of hell, there is not much ground for any deep feeling of thankfulness and the prayer of thanksgiving is little more than a casual acknowledgment to God of the many pleasant things that may be enjoyed by the individual which indeed may, if he is not careful, increase his self-satisfaction and self-centredness—a temper of mind far different from that of St Augustine, who counsels us to accept all things whether they are of comfort or discomfort from the divine Hand, remembering that that Hand is a pierced Hand.

The first ground of thanksgiving is our creation; the second our re-creation in Christ. Our creation being the first ground of thanksgiving, our every faculty, our every talent, our every opportunity to pray and serve, our every struggle with temptation, our every surrender to God whereby His victory over sin is accomplished in and through us, is an opportunity and a cause of thanksgiving. It is probably in thanksgiving that we can make most complete the precept to pray always, for every breath can be a thanksgiving. Here again there is nothing very difficult to understand, but perhaps something very hard to practise. It does not require great learning but a steady devotion. Nor does thanksgiving exclude the neighbourly relation, for it is in the contacts with and observation of the neighbour that the subject-matter of thanksgiving will arise. What is more beautiful in life than to see the turning of a soul to God? What is more comforting than to talk with one's "even Christian" about God and salvation? What calls out a deeper spirit of thankfulness than the knowledge of the grace that enables us to bear patiently the wrongs that others do unto us? In so relegating all the practical things

of life to the purpose of living we fulfil the apostolic injunction " to give thanks always for all things."

In intercession our Lord Himself teaches us in His own prayer that we ought to begin with God and not with man. We are taught " to energize " that God's Name should be hallowed and His Kingdom come and His Will be done, before any personal or corporate petition is made. But here, just as in thanksgiving, the special needs and details are to be given consideration. Our Lord's example is that He prayed for particular gifts and for particular people. There are two difficulties: one is how to ask so as to ask rightly, and not ask for that which is contrary to the will of God. All particular intercessory prayer should be made in the understanding that we desire nothing from God but the fulfilment of His holy will, and therefore in asking—and we are told in the parable to be pertinacious in asking—our requests will not be an attempt to cajole or influence the divine mind. Secondly, there is the problem of the effect of prayer on other people. Do we ourselves exercise some force or suggestion upon their mind and desires? For, if we did, it would seem a terrible interference with human liberty, and a gross assertion of our own egoistic centre. God has such respect for His creature that He would never force a will but only draw it to conversion. So to one of His saints who was distressed with this difficulty was given the answer: " Prayer never forces, it only draws." And to the practical saint, for saints are always practical, who propounded the obvious question: " What happens when they aren't drawn?" the answer was returned, " It waits."

No act of love can be ever thrown away, and real prayer which is self-sacrifice can never be lost. It becomes part of that love which holds back souls from sin and draws them to righteousness, however long the prodigal may wait and however far he may have strayed away from the Father's home. A true balance must also be kept between the prayer for the self and for the many, for it is the prayer of the just man made perfect that is of power. It would be idle to pray much for others if we had not prepared our intercession for them by earnest prayer for our own increase in virtue and cleansing from sin and imperfection.

The reality of prayer can only be tested by the fruits in the actual life that has to be lived amongst men. It is idle to expect any advance in the life of prayer unless it is

supported by an advance in what St Paul describes as the necessity to " mortify the deeds of the body." This is in the power of anybody; all that is needful is regular and careful self-examination. It is not very comfortable to find out what one is really like—that is why so many people give it up. When we have found the unregulated desires and deep-rooted selfishnesses, it is necessary with the aid of grace to eradicate them. Most people in order to keep their secular job are quite practical in living hardly, working long hours, rising early with the aid of an alarm clock; yet when it comes to prayers they suit their feelings and give God the dregs of their life.

In conclusion, it is proper to refer to the four stages of advance in the prayer life: vocal, mental, affective and simple or non-mystical contemplation, sometimes called the prayer of the will. Vocal prayer is the proper exercise in every stage for every Christian and it is the appropriate medium of all corporate prayer. The chief end of mental prayer or meditation is to strengthen faith, and by the knowledge of the revelation of God and of self to direct the attention towards the reformation of character.

A great disservice has been done by many well-intentioned and devout people by an over-insistence upon method and the special advocacy of this or that method as against other methods for directing the mind in thinking upon God. Method is necessary in order to secure discipline and attention, and the art of helping people to pray is to suggest the right method for individual people to use. However, the great masters of the early days had little except the Bible and the lives of a few saints, and they certainly prayed well. It is discouraging and quite impracticable to counsel people, who live in a few overcrowded rooms and spend most of the day in arduous and generally uninteresting toil, to spend at least ten minutes each day in a formal meditation in a place of retirement. A text or short reading from the Bible or from the gospel of the week memorized and thought over, prayed over in the bus or tram or during the lunch hour, would probably produce more result and become more simply bound up in the life than subjecting the soul to the harassment of continually failing to find the time and opportunity for the set exercise which probably could be secured only by making a special visit to a church that may not be open at a time convenient. It is, however, advisable that busy people should have one settled time during the

week to which they give not merely a few minutes but a reasonable time for a prayerful study of Scripture and to making something in the nature of a formal meditation. Without such disciplined effort there is little likelihood of prayer being carried out in the ordinary things of life. This use of the mind in a definite thinking out of things in words, whether expressed or mental, must never be given up except only when it is impossible to continue because of the strong desire not to think discursively about God any longer, but just to talk to Him in words of love. These short broken phrases of love are called aspirations and this way of prayer is termed Affective. The two are most usefully combined, as St Francis de Sales suggests, for busy people by gathering from the meditation what he terms a nosegay—some simple thought that lifts the soul to God in aspirations that may be returned to all through the day or the days that follow. What must be guarded against is any attempt to give up meditation; because the aspirations seem easier or more delightful, there is a temptation to do so. There must be at least a mental equivalent of study or reading or else the human creature is not providing the material for God to use in guiding and illuminating it. The prayer of the will is of a greater simplicity, and of little or no emotional tension. It is a loving attention, a naked adherence, and often practised in much spiritual darkness.

Prayer is not undertaken for its own sake, but for the sake of God and the good of souls, one's own soul in particular and all others which God gives one opportunity to serve. As the *Imitation* reminds us, " when judgment day cometh we shall not be asked what we have read or what we have done nor how well we have spoken but how religiously we have lived . . . He is well and truly learned who doeth the will of God and forsaketh his own will." In that forsaking is the secret of the theology of prayer.

GILBERT SHAW.

On Censorship

LAST March the veteran Italian novelist Massimo Bontempelli, a member of the Italian Academy, delivered at Pescara, on the Adriatic, a speech in commemoration of d'Annunzio, and seemingly used in the course of it ambiguous language

about liberty. At all events, the speech cost him his own. Shortly afterwards he was sentenced to *confino* or banishment for five years. A more or less similar fate, we understand, now threatens the indiscreet orator not merely in Italy but in many countries of the Continent. In those countries, furthermore, oratory is not alone the object of the state's vigilance. Books formerly in free circulation are now forbidden, foreign books can be translated only under licence, and altogether there is in force that very control of the printing press which Milton, in his famous *Areopagitica*, pleaded so eloquently against 295 years ago. Novelists like Thomas Mann, theologians like Karl Barth, scientists like Einstein, have found that they had to emigrate if they were to go on writing or teaching as they felt they should. Nor is that all. Supervised or silenced as are writers of books in the Totalitarian States, they mostly enjoy a wide latitude in comparison with writers in the newspapers. In the daily and weekly press of Germany, for example, not only comment, but the record of events is officially directed. There is about the leading articles in the various dailies a unanimity having the effect of well-executed drill. Editors do not judge for themselves what space and prominence to allot to items of information from abroad, they simply obey instructions; and whether this or that perhaps momentous item shall be published or withheld is for authority to decide. The disregard of orders or any going beyond one's brief is visited with drastic punishment.

This being the state of affairs in many countries of the continent, fears are expressed that it may soon become the state of affairs in Britain. It is being said that if the German nation, for example, is now on a war footing in peace time, we have begun to take the same road. The British government last October committed the nation to a policy obviously calling for the closest co-ordination of effort, and at the beginning of April that policy was intensified. Since it is, we understand, incidental to a co-ordinating effort that mouths are gagged and pens are on the leash in the Totalitarian States, what more likely, it is being said, than that the gag and the leash will soon be in use among us also? Especially if we go to war, as is declared to be possible, how expect that our expression of opinion will not become subject to curb-bit and rein?

I shall surprise no one by pointing out that fears of this kind cannot trouble the professing Christian. In the first

place, he is unable to look upon censorship as wrong in principle.

Censorship in one form or another the Church has constantly practised. It is true that there was no official licensing of books till after printing had been invented, but already in the early centuries of Christianity leaders of the Church never hesitated to take vigorous steps for arresting the propagation of doctrines they disapproved of. Origen, according to Didymus, the blind theologian of Alexandria, was " the greatest teacher of the Church after the apostles "; and St Jerome in a later age judged this description so appropriate that he adopted and for a time repeated it. Of the greatness of Origen there can, indeed, be no question. Yet when Origen had completed his matchless *First Principles* (Περὶ Ἀρχῶν), Demetrius, patriarch of Alexandria, called a synod of Egyptian bishops, which decided that he should no longer teach in the city, and presently he was excommunicated. Thus was the fate meted out to Massimo Bontempelli a few months ago in Italy prefigured in Christian history. And Origen ranks as but perhaps the most illustrious victim of the policy of the early Church towards the written word. Councils condemned the writings which they looked upon as either apocryphal or heretical, and the authors of heretical books were treated in accordance with the Dominical behest, " If thy hand offend thee, cut it off." With the passage of time the measures taken to check the dissemination of opinions held to be disturbing for faith or religion did not become less severe. As Milton recalls in the course of the *Areopagitica*, Martin V, the pope thanks to whose election early in the fifteenth century the Great Schism was ended, made readers as well as writers of prohibited books liable to the Church's thunderbolts. To-day the list of these books, books which it is the aim of the Congregation of the Index to keep out of the hands of the obedient, has grown truly formidable, and the interdict upon them, even upon those that have powerfully contributed to the growth of European thought, is none the less irrevocable for being subject, in the case of some by writers now long dead, to the ironical proviso, *Donec non emendentur*. Moreover, the Roman Church, as everybody is aware, continues to insist that none of its members shall publish any writing of a theological nature till he has been granted an *imprimatur*, and in our own generation Roman Catholic writers of indisputable gifts have been ordered to cease

publishing for the remainder of their lives. Thus, in the most important of the Christian Churches numerically speaking, censorship remains both wide and strict, and what is so flourishing an activity of that Church no member of any Christian Church is in a favourable position to condemn.

Opposition to censorship, indeed, usually springs from a misunderstanding of its purpose. For example, Milton's eloquence in the *Areopagitica* is all wasted upon a confusion. He supposes that the object of censorship can be what Socrates, in Plato's *Republic*, is made to declare requisite in the ideal commonwealth. He supposes that censorship is intended to halt the spread of falsehood and to speed that of truth. Not only does this betray in a man of his genius a surprisingly puerile notion of human motives; it further shows him to have been all too ready to forget why Truth has been reputed to hide at the bottom of a well. He is even ingenuous enough to go on to assert that in fair fight Truth may be relied upon to overcome Falsehood. What a comfortable place the world would be if the assertion bore the least relation to reality ! But it is of course mere rhetoric; and if, as we must suppose, Milton was in earnest when he uttered it to the House of Commons, how behind the arras jesting Pilate must have tittered ! The authors of the nineteenth and twenty-first of our Thirty-Nine Articles knew better. Far from it being possible to believe that Truth will invariably overcome Falsehood in fair fight, it has to be recognized, alas ! that Truth treats discretion as the better part of valour; and for as long as she does so men will have difficulty in establishing that anything is true except the immediate and grossest matters of fact. Fallible, they will continue to think fallaciously, and only thanks to their overweening conceit be able to insist that from their fallacies they have brought Truth forth. But all that has nothing to do with censorship. Censors are not concerned with truth and falsehood, and in that sense at any rate they are modest men. Their business is simply to put down disagreement and disputation. This being so, the object of a censorship, whether set up by a Church or set up by a secular State, must be the same.

Every Church has considered that certain matters might be left open to varieties of interpretation. But some limit has always had to be placed on the scope and extent of such matters. For it is necessarily of the nature of a Church to

unite people—how many is immaterial—in a community of worship and doctrine, and in order to hold a doctrine in common individuals need to quell their propensities to individual peculiarities of belief. As the tenacity of Wycliffites, Lollards, Puritans, and Dissenters has borne witness, in England perhaps more than elsewhere the population is inclined to split over differences on points of doctrine into intransigent groups; and it is possibly not the least of the virtues of the Church of England to have recognized this feature of the English character and to have been able to gather and retain within its fold high, low, and broad churchmen, ritualists and evangelicals. Yet all professing Christians, diverge as they otherwise may, must at least be at one in honouring Christ; and the Church of England, whatever vagaries of credenda may in other respects diversify its unity, nevertheless has its Thirty-Nine Articles. In the same way as membership of that Church has had to imply assent to those articles (except in St Magnus Martyr and a few other places !), no religious sect can avoid imposing on its adherents, however few these may be, some uniformity of tenet and therefore some restraint on individual freedom of interpretation. Let people, in the pursuit of religion, split up into groups however small; there always comes a point at which dissent can go no further, or the group must disintegrate. The congregation of some conventicle may hold that every Christian congregation should be free to worship in a different way; nevertheless, in order to remain itself a congregation it must impose on its members that they shall worship all in one way.

There lies the justification of censorship in a Church, and censorship in a secular State need offer no other. It follows that the professing Christian, recognizing the need for applying the principle of censorship in his Church or congregation at some stage, cannot object when this principle is invoked by a secular State. Every Church is a society, and none the less one for claiming divine institution. As such, it has to aim at preventing schism. Every secular State is likewise a society, and as such has to aim at preventing sedition. A secular government, in order to govern, needs to possess the approval of the overwhelming majority of the governed. It can, therefore, brook no effective challenge to the principles in virtue of which it claims to govern. That is why it was unavoidable in England at the end of the seventeenth century, not only that the Non-jurors should be

deprived, but also that to their benefices other incumbents should be preferred. What measures a government takes to prevent sedition is solely a matter of expediency. The measures require, of course, to have the tacit consent of the governed, exactly like all other measures taken in the discharge of government; but otherwise the nature of those measures will be determined solely by what is judged to be the extent of the threat of sedition. In fact, at no time has the expression of opinion in England been left entirely unsupervised. The public performance of stage plays is subject to a censorship which has been in operation in its present form since 1727, and films have come to be licensed for exhibition in the same way. If this double censorship is no doubt intended primarily to safeguard morals, and so to obviate the indignation to which offences against morals would give rise, it is likewise a check on sedition. Over the printed word a watch is kept also. Although in England the printing press has been virtually free of official supervision since the passing of the Act of Toleration in 1689, the author and printer in the case of any published book, pamphlet, or prospectus, the editor and printer in the case of a periodical or daily newspaper, are liable to prosecution if the publication is suspected of containing seditious matter. In the same way, although speech is nominally free, any person speaking in public is liable in similar circumstances to similar prosecution. That more severe measures are not taken is in no way due to respect for liberty. It is simply because prosecutions for sedition are very rare.

There is good reason, moreover, to suppose that such prosecutions are in no danger of becoming more frequent; and that is why in the second place the professing Christian, when fears are voiced that freedom of speech and of writing in England may soon be brought to an end, can listen with equanimity. Resolute as Englishmen have shown themselves to split up into religious sects, they are devoid of that instinct for sedition so strong, for instance, in the Irish. During the last War, although with a view to preventing the enemy from getting hold of information to his advantage the publication of news of events was under close control, the expression of opinion was little interfered with. I recall reading in 1915, in a periodical called *The Nation*, which was well known at that time, a letter to the editor in which Mr Clive Bell, if my memory does not traduce him, declared that he felt for his part that we should

all be as happy, and possibly be much better governed, if Britain came under German rule. In what other belligerent country at the height of a war could a statement of this kind have been printed with impunity? That does not mean, however, that our authorities were then either lax or foolish. It simply means that they understood the English character.

Napoleon is reported to have said that we are a nation of shopkeepers. It is at least as accurate to say that we are a nation of sheep. A well-disposed foreign observer has remarked that if the English cherish liberty, it is because the possession of individual freedom enables each of us to fulfil his dearest ambition, which is to do exactly as everybody else is doing. Having his eye ever fixed on " his betters "—a thoroughly English expression !—an Englishman makes his chief anxiety in life never to defy a social convention. Our ideal of demeanour is perfect uniformity; and what makes the modern notion of the " gentleman " something essentially English is that a " gentleman " is one who conforms mechanically to a code of so-called " good form " and thereby avoids the bother of remembering that he is a moral agent. The Englishman's ovine propensities are especially evident in the domain of the mind. Our scrupulous attention to conformity in social usage has led a Frenchman who has studied us to fear that we may be in process of enslaving our intelligence. He flatters us. We haven't the intelligence to enslave. No average Englishman—as, with an odd complacency, he himself will admit—is brainy. A plausible explanation of why games enjoy such popularity in this country is that during a game there is little occasion to open one's mouth. Think what agony the ordinary decent Englishman endures when under the strain of having to talk ! With what relief does he take refuge in telling some funny story ! And if volubility comes more easily to his wife, it hardly seems to be to any better purpose. Of course both Englishmen and Englishwomen are by no means chary of emitting opinions, of stating what apparently they think they think; but seldom is any opinion voiced by one of them the product of the speaker's own cerebration. Indeed, it is when professing an opinion which happens to be in vogue and that he may have acquired a moment before from the newspaper that an Englishman is most strongly convinced of possessing mental initiative. But this is only because official policy in any matter can

be opposed on grounds as insubstantial as its own. If we have our dissenters in profane as well as sacred realms, it simply means that in matters profane English people naturally gravitate into two or three rival flocks, with the result that what may be called tinned dissent is always to hand. Our differences, however, lack the fine shades. Not for us the innumerable political parties and groups that were usual on the continent twenty years ago! The Government on the one hand; His Majesty's Opposition on the other—that is enough to satisfy our need of disagreement. It is only in religious schism that we give evidence of a hair-splitting fecundity of imagination. As regards all else we confine ourselves in that British phlegm which a century ago so enhanced our legend across the Channel. In a word, intellectual activity is not our line. But, incapable as we are of humility, we never dream of deploring that we should be thus mentally deficient. Ovine even in self-satisfaction, the English look on intellect, not only with suspicion, but also with disdain.

Therefore, an English government is able to allow the most revolutionary suggestions to be put forward with impunity. To most of us the import of suggestions of this kind cannot penetrate, and those upon whom some hint of the import may eventually break incline to dismiss the matter as the nonsense of cranks. When exceptionally some new book blurts out a truth or an opinion which influential people prefer not to have too widely known or too widely shared, it does happen, of course, that pressure is put upon the publisher not to issue the book. But usually such a book is neither suppressed nor denounced. It is simply ignored. And there is the less danger that it will not be killed by being ignored that when by chance English people are confronted with an opinion the opposite of what is current or contrary to what is judged opportune, and this opinion cannot be ignored, their impulse is to diagnose insanity. For example, in 1918 Mr Siegfried Sassoon, who was then an infantry officer, suddenly decided that the War was a mistake and that he had no business to be taking part in it. This view he proceeded to communicate in writing to his military superiors. Elsewhere his act might have resulted in his being accused of seeking to imperil the State. Not in England. There was no question of his being court-martialled. He was sent before a special medical board, and the board relegated him to a lunatic asylum. By the side

of such tactics the overt methods of censorship employed in Totalitarian States look crude and flat-footed.

For that matter, perhaps the most formidable of existing obstacles to freedom of expression in this country is met with at the very outset of the process whereby expression is usually achieved. Few writers can place opinions before the public without the connivance of a publisher or editor; and editors and publishers for the most part do not differ from the common run of Englishmen. They are as suspicious and disdainful of intellectual activity as any retired major at Cheltenham. When by exception one of them happens to be enterprising and alert, he will be found to have his eye exclusively on his public, and very properly too; for he is engaged in a commercial undertaking, and one rather more speculative than most. He does not believe that the number of persons whom he could interest would warrant his issuing any product of individual thinking. Thus editors and publishers in England need no compulsion; of their own accord they act as censors of dangerous and disturbing doctrines as well as of opinions that might be merely stimulating. Playing for safety, they let pass only the hackneyed thought and the old familiar *cliché*. It will be said that there exist periodicals which are not conducted for profit, and that in these a writer may speak his mind. Most of such periodicals, however, depend on some Mæcenas; and as a rule a Mæcenas subsidizes a periodical in order to further some craze or fad that he fancies. He is seldom disposed to give an editor a free hand. Moreover, to depend on a Mæcenas is to live from hand to mouth; he is apt at any moment to find another use for his money. Few subsidized periodicals last long enough to become influential, even supposing they had the editors to make them so. Altogether, that rare person in England who belongs to no recognized political flock and has neither axe to grind nor cause to further, but who tries actually to think before putting pen to paper, finds it very difficult to get printed what he may be moved to write. In this respect *The Criterion*, a quarterly which went out of existence at the beginning of the year, was unique. The aim of its editor was simply to publish the work of writers, no matter what their opinions, who gave evidence of having minds of their own. Alien to the English temper as the aim was, it should be said in fairness to the international English-reading public to whom *The Criterion* was addressed that the extinction of

the periodical for want of support from readers does not necessarily indicate that no public would have appreciated the thorough execution of this aim. The fact is that the editor never enjoyed the opportunity of being able fully to carry the aim out. *The Criterion* printed relatively little of the original and independent work which it particularly welcomed; and why it did not print more is easily stated. At no time during its existence could the editor devote to it more than his odd moments, and the pursuit and discovery of enough original and independent work to fill each number would have been a whole-time job. Hence responsibility for the failure of *The Criterion* can no more be laid at the door of the public than on the shoulders of the editor. If any value was attached in England to the expression of independent and challenging thought, a quarterly with the aim of *The Criterion* would have inspired someone not only to endow it for the duration of the editor's life but also to endow it with sufficient generosity to enable him to have devoted to editing the time which a man habitually has to bestow on picking up a livelihood. The precarious existence and eventual disappearance of *The Criterion* are vivid testimony of the suspicion and disdain in which the English hold intellect.

This suspicion and disdain together with the mental lethargy almost universal among us, our ability to ignore whatever suggestions threaten to prove disturbing or inconvenient, the timid and exclusively commercial outlook of editors and publishers, the waywardness of Mæcenases—all this combines to impose in England an invisible censorship so effective as to render entirely needless any attempt on the part of our authorities to imitate the overt repression and regimentation of opinion now practised in Totalitarian States.

Finally, a third reason why the fear of such measures will not trouble the professing Christian in particular lies in the peculiar status of religion in this country. On the one hand the Church of England continues to be an established Church, and on the other hand religious sentiment among the population at large remains very lively. Certain people nowadays affect to deplore the decline of religion. But we are no more a godless nation to-day than we were when a dean of our Church ventured to question " the absolute necessity of extirpating the Christian religion from among us," though he was, as he hastened to say, not " so weak to stand up in defence of real Christianity such as used in

primitive times (if we may believe the authors of those ages) to have an influence upon men's belief and actions." Our churches may be empty, except those of the Roman Communion, and even they are not filled as are those in Germany. But at least the churches are still there; and, moreover, we go on paying lip-service to Christian theology and ethics, vestiges of which survive in much of our national morals and temper. In addition, religious sentiment, as I say, remains very lively among the population at large. The most striking evidence of the strength of that sentiment was given eleven years ago when Parliament, in the exercise of its constitutional duty, vetoed a Revised Prayer Book. Those churchmen whose indignation at Parliament's action on that occasion has led them to desiderate disestablishment seem to me, so far as censorship is concerned, to wish to drop the prey for the shadow. Were the Church of England to sever its ties with the State, it is difficult to believe that the primate would be able to go on exercising over national policy the influence which he is reported to have exercised lately regarding Abyssinia, the Abdication, and the absorption into Germany of Czecho-Slovakia. But more than that: so long as the head of the British State is also the head of the Church of England it is inconceivable that the state will ride roughshod over Christian principles or that a censorship will ever interfere with their affirmation. And for the preservation of professing Christians from interference the survival in the country at large of the religious sentiment which was reflected in the parliamentary rejection of the Revised Prayer Book surely constitutes the best of additional safeguards.

MONTGOMERY BELGION.

Christianity and the Public Schools

"For when by reason of the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you which be the rudiments of the first principles of the oracles of God. . . ."—Heb. v, 12 (R.V. marg.).

I

SOME months ago I was shown an article in *The Observer*[1] by Mr St John Ervine on what I understand to be one of his favourite themes. The article bore the sarcastic head-

[1] *The Observer*, November 14, 1937.

line, " It's ' Ham ' To Be Heard," and it constituted a severe indictment of that " natural " style of utterance on the stage, which to the audience is not readily distinguishable from mere inaudibility, and which, according to the writer, is, or was, affected by far too many of our younger players. But the paragraph which interested me most from a professional point of view was this:

" Many years ago, when I was new to production, I met a very able, but extremely lazy actor who . . . succeeded for a short while in humbugging me with a theory of acting. . . . It was not necessary, he said, for an actor to learn an author's words. All he had to do was to give an impression of them. . . . His method soon revealed its defects, for his acting was good only while his impression of the author's words lasted, which was seldom longer than three or four nights. He was tremendous on the first night, quite good on the second, a little hazy on the third, and a washout for the rest of the week. . . . Well, the day of the impressionistic actor is over. . . ."

The reason why that paragraph interested me professionally was that it threw a flood of light on the method of religious instruction employed in the typical English public school, which seems to be devised on principles identically similar, and to be characterized by the same impressionistic note. Let us face facts: the average ex-public school boy possesses many amiable and even admirable qualities, but he has far less idea of what the Christian religion is about and why it matters than an intelligent Bantu catechumen. That would be a serious condition of affairs at any time. It is, I think, particularly serious now.

II

Of course, there is nothing new in this indictment. Twenty-two years ago, Bishop Gore, while recognizing our young men's " deep sense of duty towards their country, of what membership in home and country and class and school and college means," felt bound to add: " But have they any such sense of what it is to be a member of Christ's Holy Catholic Church, whether in the way of hold on the corporate faith, or loyalty to the fellowship, or apprehension of grace and of the sacraments? . . . I cannot give a satisfactory answer . . . to these questions."[1]

[1] *Dominant Ideas and Corrective Principles*, by the Bishop of Oxford, p. 71.

To repeat those words to-day is not to suggest either that the problem has not been recognized or that no effort has been made to tackle it since 1917. Everyone knows that an immense amount of thought and labour has been expended on it by those who are responsible for religious instruction in our schools. That is the tragedy. There has been a sincere and conscientious effort to make Christianity attractive to the young. All that is implied by the item in the publisher's catalogue—" The Old Testament: Genesis to Esther (the parts usually read in schools) "—is mercifully a thing of the past. Much sympathetic care has been expended on the brightening of divine worship in school chapels, even if " amateur litanies " and " fancy " prayers about " high-hearted happiness," " gallant endeavour," and so on,[1] have in fact offered a far too easy target to the cheerful ribaldry of adolescence. And yet we still seem to stand very much where we did. How has this come about ? Partly, no doubt, because the percentage of religiously indifferent parents is probably higher than it was before the War. But I think the primary reason is to be sought elsewhere.

III

In the English character there is what Hoskyns called " a strange vein of emotional idealism."[2] You cannot, for instance, imagine a continental crowd singing " Abide with Me " at a football final. And it is upon this foundation of emotional idealism that our earnest pedagogues have endeavoured to rebuild the City of God. In consequence, their presentation of the Christian Faith has been essentially subjective and impressionistic, and therefore transitory in its influence. Ten years ago—that is, towards the beginning of this great experiment in religious reconstruction—three slogans, each of them a commentary on the other two, were especially popular in educational circles. The first

[1] *Against the Shepherds ! An Indictment of Public-School Religion*, by Colin Clout (C.L.A., 4d.), p. 13. *Cf. The Parish Church and the Fifth Form*, by a Public-School Master (S.P.C.K., 4d.), p. 8: " I remember being asked, in tones of ribaldry, how one was able to ' take up the sword of service,' and what was the point of using phrases like ' gallant and high-hearted happiness ' when they had long been standing school jokes, and why there was such a lot about Adventure in the special Collects."

[2] *Varieties of English Religion*, by E. C. Hoskyns (S.P.C.K., 1920, 6d.), p. 3.

was " Religion cannot be taught; it must be caught." The second rang the changes on the axiom that " Christianity, reduced to its simplest and most intelligible form, needs only two words to explain it, ' Follow Me.' " The third consisted of the one word " Service." Every one of these three slogans contained much of truth and much of value; but the three together constituted a formidable evasion of the real task; and between these three stools the presentation of the Christian Faith as something objectively valid and intellectually coherent and respectable fell to the ground. Theology was kept carefully at arm's length.

The crux of the matter was the contention that " Religion cannot be taught; it must be caught." Now, the truth in this is undeniable, and it is important that it should be recognized. As the Archbishop of York wrote in 1923, in a slightly different context and with a subtle difference of emphasis, " my own concern is not for the teaching of formularies, but for the atmosphere of suggestion . . . for the constant suggestion offered by the whole ordering of the school that it is part of the Church."[1] On a more personal and subjective plane, we find Dick Sheppard writing: " I remember in my life a period of years when I definitely decided against the claims of the Christian religion. I date those years from an episode at my public school when I discovered that the master who was instructing me in religion, and who had the reputation of being a very able and up-to-date teacher, was reading a novel during one of the services in the school chapel ":[2] while, on the other hand, the Headmaster of Westminster has written: " I have not forgotten being told by one to whom I owe much that the predominating religious influence in his own school days, among much that was dull and dead, was the quite unconscious demeanour of the master who for a single year happened to kneel next him in chapel."[3] But to elevate the inference into a policy, even if this were practicable, is open to criticism on two counts. In the first place, it would impose an intolerable strain upon the piety of the individual schoolmaster; even the Church herself

[1] Preface to a *Memorandum on Religious Education* issued by a Committee of the Manchester Diocesan Conference (S.P.C.K., 4d.): quoted in *Education and Religion*, ed. E. A. Burroughs (1924), p. 242. [2] *Education and Religion*, p. 218. [3] In *The Recall to Religion* (Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1937), p. 107.

insists that the unworthiness of the minister doth not hinder the efficacy of the sacrament. In the second place, it presupposes a confusion between the teaching of religion and instruction in divinity.

It is not altogether fair to expect the schools to teach religion. The wind bloweth where it listeth; and the schoolmaster who attempts to teach religion in those periods when he is supposed to be teaching Scripture is likely to encounter disillusionment not only in the results of the School Certificate Examination. But it is fair to expect the schools to teach what Christianity is about, and why it matters in the eyes of those who hold to it. It is fair to expect the schools to impart a working knowledge of the elements of Christian doctrine—that is, Theology—as an ordered system, and to inculcate an intellectual respect for it at least as great as that which boys are taught to pay to Classics or to History or to Higher Mathematics or to any other subject in the educational curriculum. And lastly, it is fair to expect the schools to teach the technique of Christian living and of Christian dying. All this is perfectly straightforward and objective. It would be unreasonable to demand more; it would be inexcusable to be satisfied with less.

With this in mind, it may not be impertinent at this point to suggest one or two practical reforms. For example, there are some schools in which boys are still prepared for confirmation by their housemasters, who, however public-spirited and conscientious they may be, are generally laymen without the necessary technical qualifications for their task. The results are melancholy indeed. Preparation for confirmation is a priest's job and ought to be done by priests.[1] The older housemasters are naturally tenacious of this opportunity for intimate personal contact with their boys:[2] but if those bishops who administer the sacrament of confirmation in public schools would be careful to satisfy themselves that the candidates presented to them have been adequately instructed in the Christian Faith, a notable

[1] *Cf. Against the Shepherds !* p. 26. [2] *Cf. The English Tradition of Education*, by Cyril Norwood (1929), p. 36, where the custom is naively defended on this very ground. "There is no other time when they can get close to their boys' minds and souls so easily. . . . This chance once well taken, the Housemaster and the boy are then on totally different terms from those on which they have been, a relation of natural friendship and confidence."

improvement might be secured. Secondly, it should be possible to arrange that, in normal circumstances, no clergyman should be allowed to teach in a public school without at least two years of previous parochial experience; the principal abnormal circumstance to be contemplated is that of the lay headmaster who seeks holy orders in middle life. Thirdly, the pulpit in the school chapel should be deliberately utilized for the purpose of giving systematic courses of instruction in Christian belief and practice: the present haphazard method, under which headmasters invite outside preachers to " come and preach," rather as one puts on a new gramophone record, is at once distracting and unfair to all concerned, and is no doubt largely responsible for that excessive emphasis on ethics as against doctrine by which historic Christianity becomes sublimated into sentimental " uplift " divorced from the life of the historic Church. There are also a few minor reforms to be suggested, such as that boys who are sick should have some opportunity to receive the holy communion. But the primary necessity is to secure an efficient, intelligent, and coherent presentation of the Christian Faith.[1]

IV

But can we count on the co-operation of the public-school headmasters in this endeavour? A few years ago, an eminent headmaster wrote: " I sometimes hear religious men and women, speaking of their education, complain that they were never taught this or that doctrine of the Church. My answer to such would be to remind them that what Plato said of education generally is especially true of education in religion: it is not something which you can take ready-made and put into someone's mind, like sight into a blind eye. . . . Mathematics or chemistry, I believe, can be taught by formulæ; but not religion."[2] Once more we observe the confusion between the teaching of religion and instruction in divinity. Another headmaster has asserted (falsely, as I think) that " boys are not ready for any but the simplest doctrinal teaching: they do not understand it, and are not interested by it. Their problems are problems of conduct, their minds nebulous and changing, a field in

[1] *Cf. Peace and Happiness*, by H. L. Paget (1922), p. 92. [2] *Brethren and Companions*, by Frank Fletcher (1936), p. 157.

which ideals are beginning to gather and to take shape."[1] It is not, however, obvious why right conduct should be thus dissociated from right opinion, or why it should be undesirable to introduce concrete doctrinal teaching into nebulous and changing minds. The underlying fallacy of this whole school of thought is the implied denial that religious education involves for the rising generation an intellectual background for religion, and concrete loyalties. Worship, which is the characteristic service of religion, and Theology, which is the intellectual formulation and interpretation of religion, are vitally connected. Worship requires an intellectual basis, and without this intellectual basis it will be unintelligent and possibly idolatrous. One of the most conspicuous limitations of English religion at the present time is its lack of any adequate doctrine of Redemption.[2] To this it may be added that while "it is perfectly true of the Christian religion that all which is necessary for salvation can be presented to the simple-minded," it is an entirely different matter "to suggest, either by omission or otherwise, that the Christian religion is credible if its *intellectual* formulation is either simple or unimportant."[3]

In speaking of the failure of the public schools to teach the technique of Christian living and of Christian dying, I have suggested that their failure is as much practical as theoretical. But the one is a product of the other. It is unreasonable to expect that people will continue to practise a religion in which they have been insufficiently instructed. I know that as a nation we are apt to pride ourselves on our capacity for "muddling through"; but it is dangerous to place too much reliance on it, either in spiritual or in temporal things.

The real criticism of religious education in our public schools is that, broadly speaking, it attempts to teach what is not teachable and does not attempt to teach what is teachable. You cannot teach religion, but you can teach what to believe and what to do. For instance, every boy who leaves his public school ought to know at least three alternative methods of prayer: and heaven knows that is not very many, out of all the methods available, tested and

---

[1] Norwood, *op. cit.*, p. 29. [2] *Cf. The Redeemer*, by W. J. Sparrow Simpson (1937), Introduction. [3] Article: "The Teaching of Divinity," by Sir Will Spens, in *The Review of the Churches*, vol. vi., p. 42.

tabulated by nineteen hundred years of study, investigation and experiment. He ought to know that the normal fully-developed adult—and I am speaking of spiritual, not of mental or physical, development—needs half an hour of prayer every day, or an absolute minimum of twenty minutes. He ought to know what it means to make a retreat, and what is the value of it. He ought to know that when he marries, the Church expects him and his wife to receive the holy communion together at the earliest possible opportunity, preferably at the conclusion of the wedding. He ought to know his duty in the matter of fasting and of almsgiving. Above all, perhaps, he ought to know how to make a confession, just as he ought to know how to drive a motor-car or to bind up an artery, because it is precisely the sort of knowledge of which he may one day find himself in need. It is true that only the Holy Spirit of God can teach repentance: but any instructed Christian can teach what are the ordinary methods of self-examination. The schoolmasters cannot secure that their teaching in these matters is accepted and carried into practice; but they can see that it is learnt.

V

I have not touched on an initial difficulty—namely, the fact that the English public schools seem never to have quite made up their minds whether, or how far, they are Anglican; and this, no doubt, must be allowed to qualify much that I have said. But the main line of the argument is surely unimpaired by these considerations. It should, perhaps, be guarded by the emphatic warning, first, that the intellectual acceptance of the verities of the Christian Faith is something less than Christianity, and, second, that the technique of Christian living has in the last analysis no saving efficacy, for you cannot earn the prize of everlasting life merely by playing the game according to the rules. But neither can you earn it by ignoring all the rules or by not even knowing that they exist. It is completely futile to be cross with people who are ignorant of the existence of these rules; it is not their fault. But have we not a right to be angry with the men who have fraudulently kept back and concealed from us so large and vital a part of our inheritance as members of the Body of Christ? It is inexcusable to hazard everything upon emotional idealism. It is unpardonable

to suggest that Christianity is a matter of subjective opinion and experience. It is utterly inadequate to point with optimistic vagueness to the figure of our Lord, to substitute elevated notions about "service" for systematic and disciplined instruction in the technique of Christian living and of Christian dying, or to take shelter in the *cliché* that "religion can't be taught and must be caught." Nor may we, ostrich-like, defend ourselves by urging that, for boys, religion is not a matter of right teaching, but of right living: "They who do the will shall know the doctrine, and the first call is to do the will."[1] That line of argument was anticipated and demolished many years ago by the sardonic lines of Clough:

'Action will furnish belief'; but will that belief be the true one?
That is the point, you know; however, it doesn't much matter.

The trouble is that it does matter, and that it matters ultimately more than anything else in all the world.

VI

It would, however, be erroneous and misleading to conclude upon a pessimistic note, for there are many public schools to-day in which the chaplains are showing a real understanding of the nature and the necessity of their task, and upon almost every hand there are encouraging signs of a reaction against what may for convenience be termed the Norwood-Dearmer phase of public school religion.[2] And it is to the men who, amid peculiar difficulties and discouragements, are patiently endeavouring to restore historic Christianity to its rightful place in that highly specialized environment, that this article is dedicated.

CHARLES SMYTH.

Christianity and the Imagination[3]

THE main driving-power in life is the imagination. Imagination, and incidentally a sense of humour to keep

[1] Norwood, *op. cit.*, p. 55. [2] *Cf.* articles: "Public School Religion," in *Platform*, March, 1939, by the Rev. D. H. Booth, Chaplain of Tonbridge School, and "School Chapel Christianity," in *The Church Times*, March 3, 1939. [3] Commencement address delivered at the General Theological Seminary, New York, on May 24, 1939. The address, as will appear, is primarily directed to candidates for ordination, but it has a wider application.

it healthy, are so immensely important in human nature that they must be important in divine nature also. Only a Being supremely endowed with humour and imagination could have created the fascinating spiritual animal, man. Yet this point has not been prominent in Christian thought as a whole. God's other attributes have been emphasized; not these. Why?

One reason is that Christianity, which is still young in the world, comparatively speaking, has had to compete with age-old paganism, wherein humour and imagination were associated with certain deities whose conduct, from the Christian ethical standpoint, was often extremely reprehensible. Thus a shade was cast, for Christians, upon imagination and humour and upon the secular art in which they find expression. Profane literature, so called, was marked off sharply from Holy Writ. To be sure, since the twelfth century it has been increasingly recognized that the Christian thinker ought to be well versed in secular letters. But only within the past hundred years has it begun to be generally known that secular art—for example, Shakespearean comedy at its best—is in its way a valid revelation of the divine nature. This truth, attested by many thinkers of our own time, will spread more and more. Christian ministers, so far from neglecting secular literature, will regard it as a great instrument which they must understand and use.

But of course the human imagination, unlike the divine, is tragically impure. It is the greatest driving-power in the world for evil, as well as for good. It is like electricity and the other forces of the physical universe which may be employed for the benefit or for the destruction of humanity, as everybody to-day knows very well. We ought to know still better that the use of those physical forces, and of all human powers, is determined eventually by the imagination. This must be won more and more for the spirit of Christ. During the centuries ahead of us Christianity, throughout the whole world, must strive to comprehend, engage, and command the whole of the human imagination.

In this great work the Anglican communion throughout the world may have a crucial rôle. For what is required is an imaginational *via media*, a middle way which shall be the highway, between the extremes. To right and left are the extremes—not represented exclusively by any particular denomination, not unrepresented in our own:

on the left, extreme Protestantism, cut off from certain primal sources of imaginational power; on the right, extreme Catholicism, maintaining certain barriers against imaginational growth. The *via media*, of course, may fail, as *viæ mediæ* often do; but not necessarily, since with God all things are possible. With ever-deepening humility and effort the *via media*, tempering the extremes, may build a catholic Christianity that will dominate, not just the Romanized occident as of old, but human society as a whole.

This work will be done by and through individual persons. You, in your parishes, will presently find a certain type of person whom I shall call "the young imaginer"—a young man or woman gifted with imagination, but hostile or indifferent to Christianity. This young person may in time become a popular artist, speaker, or writer—journalist, poet, critic, novelist; in any event his conversation wherever he goes will be striking and effectual. He will influence many individuals, each of whom in turn will affect others, for such is the way of the imagination. A single young imaginer will thus in the course of his life exert an influence upon thousands or many thousands of persons, for good or for ill. Is it not clear, then, that you should expend more pastoral care upon one young imaginer who is astray than upon ninety and nine just persons (more or less unimaginative) who are safe in the fold? In dealing with him you must be wise as serpents while harmless as doves. I suggest that your strategy should have three phases.

First, you will show your young imaginer, not without humour, that his disbelief in Christianity does not arise from his own original thinking, much less from what is deepest in himself, but is due very largely to historical circumstances; above all, to the Great Schism that rent the Christian Church four centuries ago. Thus, you will take upon the institution which you represent the blame for his unbelief. This will be good tactics, as well as the tragic truth. For, owing to the Great Schism, the Church was unable to cope with the vast flood of modern knowledge and modern imaginings that presently began to rise. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries she had been able to absorb triumphantly a profusion of what was then modern and startling knowledge. But in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries she was unable to do likewise, because her mind was divided and backward. Hence a great many

persons of intellect and imagination forsook the Church; notably Emerson and Carlyle. Those two powerful and influential writers were pure and lofty in character, firm believers in God, and devoted admirers of Jesus of Nazareth. But throughout their long careers they abetted each other in stedfastly rejecting the dogma on which the Church is founded, the Incarnation, the uniqueness of the divine manifestation in Christ. They were not really repelled by that doctrine in itself (I make this assertion after a careful study of their utterances), but by the narrow-minded way in which it was envisaged by a Church that seemed to them, in the early and middle nineteenth century, decidedly moribund. And their attitude was widely typical.

Since then, by the mercy of God, the situation has wonderfully changed. Leading thinkers in most branches of the Church have accepted and mastered modern knowledge; at the same time the evil spirit of sectarianism has abated. To-day we are looking forward with fresh hope to a federal reunion of the Church in the distant future. Perhaps the young imaginer in the thirtieth century, like young Dante in the thirteenth, will be captivated by the full-orbed beauty and majesty of the catholic Christian Church, even while critical of her perennial faults. Meanwhile, the young imaginer is wandering between two worlds, one gone, one waiting to be born; and so you will need to have a profound sympathy with him. As I have suggested, you should first remove from his mind an historical clog. Then you can persuade him to remove his eyes from the microscope that modern naturalistic thought has set up between him and the Holy Scriptures. You can get him to read for himself, with true naturalness, the Gospel story; at the close of which he will be impelled to exclaim, as he looks up to the Cross, " This is indeed the Son of God."

In the third place, you may show him that only with the aid of the Church, and especially of the holy eucharist, can he attain a realization of that universal society of souls, on earth and in eternity, which the Church imperfectly represents. I wish to dwell on this matter.

In the last act of a recent and delightful American drama, there is a dismal religious error: the author represents the souls of the newly dead preparing for their eternal progress by trying to forget entirely those whom they loved on earth. The dramatist got this inhuman notion from inhuman philosophy. Philosophy, so helpful in its right place, has

a strong tendency to be inhuman; for in reacting from *primitive* superstition it is apt to override the *primal* instincts of the human heart. That pure but thin-blooded pagan saint, Plotinus, has done much harm with his dictum that communion with the most high God is a " flight of the alone to the Alone." A primal human instinct tells us that those whom we call the dead do not lose their interest in us; and that, at their best, they are mediators between us and the Most High. Some time ago there was discovered in South America a primitive Indian village at the centre of which stood an empty wigwam for the souls of the good dead —not the bad dead; they were excluded. To this rude shrine the villagers repaired to converse with beneficent spirits. That primitive village had hold of a primal fact. Several years ago there came to the United States a young Chinese student, who after a while confided to one of his teachers that he was greatly aided in his life and work here by the fact that two pious old aunts of his at home were daily interceding for him at the shrine of his ancestors. An acquaintance of mine, an Episcopalian, has informed me that during his devotions in church he often says a short prayer to his deceased mother—a very good woman, who while alive on earth attended and loved that same church.

Countless illustrations could be given of this primal instinct. Suffice to say that it has expressed itself in the Christian veneration for the Saints, and that it culminates in the adoration of the glorified Christ. Extreme Protestantism, by renouncing all mediators excepting Him, injures fatally the natural basis of the worship of Him; giving Him a lonely and unnatural station in eternity which, in fact, has proved to be untenable. This inhuman way of glorifying Christ glorifies Him out of existence as an eternal being. On the other hand the official saint-worship of extreme Catholicism needs—well, it needs to be handled with care. It can be discussed by followers of the *via media* with a sort of smiling earnestness: smiling, because this cult is subject to absurd abuses; earnestness, because it expresses an old and deep human intuition. The official calendar of the Saints will have to be reformed. For example, the Catholic Church of the future will canonize John Wesley as well as Sir Thomas More. Recently I have been talking with Methodist friends to whom that great servant of Christ is a real, mediating presence. This is the true kind of saint-

worship. It should be plainly recognized, and more and more developed.

Queen of the Saints is she whom all generations shall call blessed. Let us try to look at this matter simply and humanly. A child's natural relation to his mother is such that she can largely make or unmake his character. And as there could be nothing unnatural (however supernatural) in the birth and upbringing of our Lord, we may say, in a paradox, that the life of God Himself upon earth could have been spoiled by the wrong kind of mother. But she was chosen. And He derived not just His physical but much of His spiritual nature from her. The Church was right in perceiving that she must have been not only immaculate in the negative sense but possessed, above all women, of a positive and potent grace of purity, humility, and mercy. In the late Middle Ages her cult became commercialized and degraded. And during the past four hundred years a very large number of persons, including myself and doubtless many of you, were brought up to fear and even hate Mariolatry. But this attitude is still more inhuman than the opposite extreme. In early days the Blessed Mother of God superseded mercifully the cruel pagan mother-goddesses of fertility. But to-day the old devotion to gross fertility has been extended dreadfully by machines, and machine-guns, by mass production and mass conflict. The religion of material gain has sacrificed, physically and spiritually, a far larger percentage of the earth's population in the twentieth century after Christ than was possible in the twentieth century before Him. Surely modern society with its vast impure fertility needs the intercession of her who was, and in heaven is, for all generations, sublimely fertile in purity.

However, what I wish to emphasize is the general truth underlying all the particulars which I have mentioned —namely, the fact that God, who created and is always re-creating the human imagination, can and will satisfy all its legitimate demands. John Keats declared that "what the imagination seizes as beauty must be truth." This is an hyperbole, but let us take its best meaning: the imagination, in so far as it is devoted to pure beauty, may be the vehicle of divine truth. It is our medium of communion with what Keats elsewhere calls "the grandeur of the mighty dead." Those beneficent presences, invisible to our physical eyes, are envisaged, though imperfectly,

by the eye of imagination. And the Christianity which may ultimately conquer the world, demoting the false religion of nationalism, and absorbing into its own sphere whatsoever is true and lovely in Buddhism, Shintoism, and other creeds—the Church which can overarch the whole of human society—must be in living communion with the whole of the universal society, headed by Christ, our elder brother and king.

This is the vision which all young imaginers in their inmost heart desire. Some years ago a young collegian declared to me: " I have to keep myself, by force, away from the communion service. It appeals so strongly to my emotions that it spoils my thinking, which, at best, is clearly against the Church." Later on that young person was led to discern the eucharistic presence, not by anyone's arguments, but by the example of a certain humble priest who, devoted to the eucharist, lived out the truth of it in his daily life. No strategy that you may use, no words that you may say to your young imaginer, will have much effect unless enforced by your example. This ancient truth has been badly obscured by the modern worldly cult of social service. Thousands of kind-hearted social workers, and many who are called ministers of religion, go in so ardently for service that they fail to attend to their own spiritual health; often they lose faith entirely and become embittered. In trying to serve men they injure or destroy that within themselves which in the long run is most serviceable to men; forgetting the example of Him who insisted upon continually retiring for prayer, who sanctified Himself that others might be sanctified.

He sanctified His imagination. The imagination of Christ, which is the imagination of God, should be studied continually by young ministers, of any denomination, who are trying to find and follow and build up what may be termed the catholic *Via Media*. Our Lord is in a special sense your High Priest. For His imagination is, on the one hand, bold, flexible, originative; on the other, fully conservative of all human values. He conserves old things by making all things new: almsgiving, fasting, marriage, celibacy; the Law, the Temple, the priestly office; the Sacrament; the Cross; the instinct of immortality; the invisible Society; the mysteries of personality, human and divine. He does not depersonalize the virtues, as philosophy does, and must, in studying them. For Him they are functions of healthy

and health-giving personality. He does not say, Blessed is righteousness, but, Blessed are they, those persons, who hunger and thirst for it and shall be filled with it. He does not analyse " the Highest Will," but shows us that the doing of it is eternal meat and drink for persons. The " Highest Good " of philosophy is an abstraction from the Father in Heaven whom Christ revealed. To be sure, our Lord does on occasions employ philosophic reasoning, as His priests must be prepared to do also. But the outstanding fact is that in His case the highest findings of human thought are absorbed into and transfigured by a divinely human imagination, uniquely pure and powerful, able to be the supreme driving-power in life; and, as such, complete in peace and charity.

Whenever you shall find your imagination over-excited, restless or sentimental, you will know that it is not of God. You will know that it is of God, and be grateful for it, in so far as it burns, like flame of the altar, with intense peace. Then it will illumine for you all the faces you meet. Each of those faces, notably that of the young imaginer for whom I am entreating your special ministration, will at times wear expressions that can shock, repel, and dishearten you. But through and beyond the fleshly face of each person you will discern a countenance more pure and vital which God has designed for this child of His, and which Christ and all the company of heaven perceive and love. A certain prayer entreats God to kindle in our hearts that fire of charity which His Son Jesus Christ sends forth ever from His inmost Heart upon this earth and wills that it shall burn with vehemence.[1] Charity-in-peace is the bond of all virtues because it is so much more than a virtue. It is the pure fire of the divine imagination; all-embracing and all-searching; creating and re-creating; trying to make every person, in time and eternity, an ever fuller medium of the inexhaustible divine life: that God may be all in all.

G. R. Elliott.

[1] Adapted from a Roman Catholic prayer for the month of June in devotion to the Sacred Heart.

MISCELLANEA

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Mr Balfour is a Fellow of King's College, Cambridge.

The Rev. Gilbert Shaw, who was formerly Organizing Secretary of the Association for Promoting Retreats, is now working at the Sydney Mission in Poplar.

Mr Belgion is the author of *Our Present Philosophy of Life* (1929), *The Human Parrot* (1931), and *News of the French* (1938).

The Rev. Charles Smyth is Fellow and Dean of Chapel of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and Hon. Canon of Derby. His article incorporates a sermon preached at St Paul's Cathedral on the first Sunday after Easter.

Dr Elliott is Professor of English Literature in Amherst College, Mass., U.S.A. His two chief publications are *The Cycle of Modern Poetry* (1929) and *Humanism and Imagination* (1938), which can be obtained in England through the Oxford University Press.

Dr Cross is a Librarian of Pusey House, Oxford.

The Rev. R. R. Hartford, B.D., is Archbishop King's Professor of Divinity at Trinity College, Dublin.

NOTES

ST MATTHEW XIII, 44

The kingdom of heaven is like unto treasure hid in a field; the which, when a man hath found, he hideth, and for joy thereof goeth and selleth all that he hath, and buyeth that field.

Invasion threatened, and the householder fled. He took on his back some necessary things, left household goods to their fate, but buried in his little bit of land what was really valuable, meaning to come back when the war was over. It sounds very up to date.

But he died in the troubles, and afterwards another man, inspecting the property, which had passed into other hands, saw signs of the ground having been dug up for no apparent reason. He made secret investigations, which confirmed his suspicions. He was not a rich man, and, to make an offer which the owner would accept, had to sell everything he possessed. His action was perfectly fair. The original owner could not be traced, finding was keeping, and there was no law of treasure trove.

The treasure is the kingdom of heaven, for which one must venture all, the richness of the house of God. There is a time

when we wonder whether we were wise. We have lost the pleasures of this world and the new life and its possibilities are not yet realized—just as there was a moment when the man in the parable had sold all that he had and not yet obtained peaceful possession. Suppose someone had anticipated him and the cache was empty !

But what is the field ? Surely the Church on its external side. You cannot have the treasure without buying the field too. You may not want it, but that does not matter. On this interpretation the meaning is that of St Paul's treasure in earthen vessels. The vessels are heavy and awkward to carry. How awkward, the clergy and faithful laity of the Church of England know only too well. The burden of making both ends meet in parishes, unwieldy rectories, the creaking wheels of central and diocesan administration, naughty choir boys—there is no end to the catalogue. But the man in the parable for joy of the treasure *bought the field.*

W. K. L. C.

The Family Reunion. By T. S. Eliot. (The Westminster Theatre.)

The play recently running at the Westminster Theatre was essentially the work of a Christian; and the bewildered reactions of the pagan critics would be amusing if they were not ironical. *The Family Reunion* has been accused of derivation from the *Eumenides* without the piteous grandeur of Æschylean tragedy, of attempting to repeat *Mourning Becomes Electra*; and of dying in the last ditch of "impressionist" drama. The truth is (as a reading of the play inclined me to believe and a visit to the theatre convinced me) that these criticisms are the result of a misunderstanding—both of Mr Eliot's purpose and of his philosophy. *Mourning Becomes Electra* was Greek tragedy in modern dress—Sophocles in terms of Freud; but *The Family Reunion* is not the Eumenides in modern dress—or even a parallel of the Greek story. It is a sublimation—a deliberate translation of the Greek *motif* into what I can only describe as the flesh-and-blood-terms of incarnational religion. It is not, or is not merely, the working out of a tragic human theme; but the expression of that theme in eternal concepts of sin and redemption.

Harry, Lord Monchensey, returns after eight years' absence to the bosom of his family in their country home—on his mother's birthday. Vague rumours precede him—rumours of his wife's death while on his travels with him by being swept off the deck by a passing wave; and of Harry's consequent mental derangement. He has not returned many minutes, however, before the audience realizes that he is sane with that intense, all-seeing sanity which, like Hamlet's, makes the others seem a little mad. He, too, is haunted, but not by the sins of another—though his

guilt typifies a state of mind which is universal among those whose thoughts have never been redeemed. He believes that it was he who pushed his own wife off the boat, because he knows that he killed her in will even if his hands never did the deed. During the second Act it emerges that his father wished his mother's death in the same way; and that Harry is but a pawn in the family curse.

This is Æschylean tragedy only in form—the means by which Harry expiates his sin being wholly alien to Greek art. There were moments when Aunt Agatha (his mother's sister and the woman who should have been his mother but for the curse) shared his vision to a degree of intensity that can finally show him the way to his own salvation. The other members of the household—in various degrees of shade—know nothing of their secret until his mother's embittered realization of her empty part in his life. That is a wholly modern scene—though I think it just blends (as did Mr Eliot's " Shavian " epilogue in *Murder in the Cathedral*) with the pattern of the whole; and nowhere does the play's universal application blur or obscure the individual story. It is a play in the real sense of the word—not only an argument; and its intellectual excitement never flags—even though the " dramatic " temperature necessarily rises and falls.

Perhaps the most remarkable feature of the acting was the fact that each member of the cast rose to real heights of individuality when speaking or acting on their own, and yet fell perfectly into place whenever a " chorus " part was demanded of them. This was a real achievement which did much to keep going the two sides of the theme—its universal and particular aspects. Miss Helen Haye, as the Dowager Lady Monchensey and mother of Harry, played the part with clarity and distinction—her ugly disillusionment at the end never quite ruffling her superficiality. Miss Catherine Lacey played the difficult part of Aunt Agatha with a deeply sensitive response to its lights and shades—while the slight but solid sketch of a country policeman, as done by Mr Charles Victor, deserves special mention. Upon Mr Michael Redgrave, as Harry, all the real hardships of the evening fell; and I could not help feeling that he rose superbly to almost every occasion—as he passed through his febrile tragedy to a mental and spiritual redemption in personal sacrifice. This character—in whom there is so much more of Hamlet than of Orestes—would doubtless lend itself to many interpretations, and one may hope that others will take up the trail which Mr Redgrave has so confidently blazed.

Ashley Sampson.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE CONDITIONS FOR A JUST WAR

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

May I express my gratitude for Mr C. S. Lewis's letter in your May number and offer a few comments?

1. Mr Lewis inquires who are the "theologians" to whom I appeal and what is their authority for us. The XXXVIIth Article of Religion in its Latin form, which is equally authoritative with the English, declares that "it is lawful for Christian men, at the commandment of the Magistrate, to wear weapons, and serve in *just wars* (*justa bella administrare*)." It thus appeals to a theology of just wars, which in fact goes back through Aquinas to Augustine. The theology of war has, however, received its fullest treatment from the sixteenth and seventeenth century Salmanticenses, in particular Vittoria, Suarez and Vasquez. Their authority, both for Romans and for us, is, I imagine, simply that of experts in their subject; their teaching is summarized in Eppstein's *Catholic Tradition of the Law of Nations*, II. v. Our own Bishop Hall also deals with the matter on the traditional lines in his *Cases of Conscience*, II. 9; it would be interesting to know what other post-Reformation Anglican theologians have discussed the matter, if any.

2. I agree that the duty of decision as to the fulfilment of the conditions is binding primarily on the government. Vittoria, however, at least is clear that the individual cannot be excused *all* responsibility (Eppstein, p. 103; *cf.* pp. 122, 123, paras. 7, 8). And under an alleged democracy, wherein it is considered to be the duty of citizens at election time to turn out a government that has acted wrongly, this duty of judgment is presumably far stronger than under an autocracy. I do not deny the right and duty of the individual to trust his government if he believes he has reason to do so; I do urge, however, that he must consider whether it *is* trustworthy and not blindly obey it simply because it is the government. And this duty will obviously bind in proportion to the intelligence and opportunity of enlightenment of the individual; the professional student of international affairs must use more diligence than the man who is illiterate. And, in any case, can we be quite confident that a government is making its decisions according to Christian principles when no authoritative denial has been given of the widespread impression that it is planning the bombing of enemy civilians, which Mr Lewis rightly repudiates as a most indefensible method of war?

3. Christian witness need not consist in all Christians taking the same action; it can consist in all being obviously actuated by the same principles. For, apart from the difficulty of weighing up a complicated situation, different people will have different sets

of claims upon them to reconcile. It is vital that the pacifist and the combatant should not excommunicate one another, but shall be ready to recognize each other's sincerity and the difference in their situations. What finer witness could there be than the exhibition of charity between pacifist and combatant and between Christians on both sides in the War?

4. One form of witness should be the enlightenment of the government by the Church as to what the conditions of a just war are. This is surely, among other things, what the bishops are in the House of Lords for.

5. I agree entirely with Mr Lewis about the illegitimacy of bombing civilians. The question of justice in war concerns not only the outbreak of war but also its means, and of these that of reprisals on civilians is perhaps the most abominable. In another war it will not, I imagine, be only the pacifist who will find himself in prison or facing the firing-squad.

I am not sure that this gets us much further as regards anything that the world will recognize as a United Christian Front. But united fronts are not the only methods of Christian witness; there is also the witness of charity and fortitude. *Fiat justitia, ruat coelum*, and in the early Church the witnesses—the *martyrs*—were not in the majority.

Yours faithfully,
E. L. MASCALL.

THE BISHOP'S HOSTEL,
LINCOLN.
May 11, 1939.

P.S.—May I call attention to the very important letter from Fr Victor White, O.P., in the *Catholic Herald* of May 12, which is one of the most valuable statements on the subject that has appeared?—E.L.M.

COMMENT ON PERIODICALS

(*a*) THEOLOGICAL

A GLANCE through the current theological reviews will show how ubiquitous is the theme, in one shape or another, of the increasing tension between the claims of the individual and the claims of society in face of a disintegrating social order. This, it would seem, is the peculiar problem of our time; and there is no escape. "The retreat of the intellectuals" is the thesis of an article, "Reinstating the Individual," by J. C. Hardwick in the March number of *The Modern Churchman*:[1] a version of *le trahison des clercs* which imputes the growing triumph of totalitarianism to the nervelessness of liberal thought. "Of recent years the liberal idealists and intellectuals would appear to have lost faith, if not in their peculiar

[1] Blackwell, 1s.

doctrines, then in their power to convince an erring world of their truth." A policy of " personal isolationism " has robbed them of influence in the world of events. Mr Hardwick prescribes " a new philosophy of the individual " as a tonic for this pernicious anæmia; among his ingredients he includes: (*a*) an acceptance of the individual's place in society, leading on to a revised concept of personal freedom; (*b*) a realization of the unique position of *Art* in relation to truth, and of Art's emphasis on the individual (here the reader might profitably pursue the hint of identity of purpose between Art and Religion); (*c*) " a reasonable exposition of what is meant by freedom of the will." Mr Hardwick makes the interesting point, in conclusion, that the totalitarian ideology of the twentieth century is the child of nineteenth-century science. This suggests some hope, perhaps, for the future. Mr Hardwick's analysis is based, in the last resort, upon a traditional idealistic philosophy. This standpoint is rejected by Viscount Samuel in a brilliant essay on " The Scientist and the Philosopher " in the April *Hibbert Journal*.[1] He pleads for an integration of the results of science with the theories of philosophy and an abandonment of the idealist position which has marked Western thought since Kant. We must accept Man's place *inside* Nature, reject logic as the foundation of philosophy and dialectic as its instrument, and abandon the idea of objective values. " A large part of the classic philosophies of the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries must be definitely discarded." The abandonment of abstract propositions would result, among other benefits, in a simplification of the language used by philosophers. Returning from these heights to the arena, we find the phrase " Moral Rearmament " and its implications occupying the attention of writers in the same issue of *The Modern Churchman* and in *Blackfriars*.[2] In the former the Rev. Norman Darrall issues a reasoned plea for better thinking in the sphere of religion. Five per cent. of the population of this country, according to the writer's estimate, are attached to forms of institutional religion. A small percentage: but progress *can* be secured through an intelligent minority. What proportion of this five per cent., Mr Darrall asks, can be considered intelligent? The question is devastating. Articles in the October and January numbers of *The Hibbert Journal* calling attention, *inter alia*, to the deplorable intellectual level of the clergy receive a peculiarly unconvincing reply from Canon Prideaux in the current issue of that periodical. Until this elementary fact is faced, we may call a halt to conferences on the causes of religious apathy in this country. Emotion, in place of intelligence, has its successes, as Fr Hilary J. Carpenter points out in his penetrating analysis of the Oxford Group in the April *Blackfriars*; but they are unworthy and

[1] George Allen and Unwin, 10s. per annum. [2] Blackwell, 1s.

transitory ones. Of more specialized interest are articles in the March *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*[1] and the March *Etudes*:[2] the one discussing *L'enseignement moderne de la religion et vie surnaturelle* —a brilliant study by G. Delcuve conducted with all the precision of French dogmatic and ascetic theology; the other providing a new estimate of the character and work of François Villon, of intense interest to the man of letters and the moral theologian alike.

BERNARD BLACKSTONE.

(*b*) LITERARY

Amongst the younger group of poets there is one of whom we shall hear more in the future—W. H. Auden. Already Mr Auden has written a considerable amount, including his *Poems*, *The Orators*, *The Dance of Death*, *The Dog Beneath the Skin*, and *The Ascent of F. 6.* Apart from the Auden number of *New Verse* there has been practically no attempt to assess the value or otherwise of his work. This gives an added interest to Stephen Spender's article in the last (and final) number of *The London Mercury* on "The Importance of W. H. Auden." Auden has, says Mr Spender, "three main approaches to his material. One of these is psycho-analytical, the second is political, and the third, and the least apparent approach, is religious. The third is . . . by far the most important, because the main impulse of his poetry is the working out of a philosophy of life based on a religious view of life. . . ." What precisely is meant by a "religious view of life" is clear neither to Mr Spender nor to Auden himself, for Auden is in the transitional stage in the sense that his ideas on religion have yet to be clarified and crystallized. But there are certain indications as to the direction in which he is moving revealed both in *The Orators*:

> Not, Father, further do prolong
> Our necessary defeat;
> Spare us the numbing zero-hour,
> The desert-long retreat.

and in *The Dog Beneath the Skin :*

> Christ crucified
> Be at my side,
> Confirm my mind
> That it be kind
> To those who assert and hurt
> On either side !

Whether he will discover the meaning of "Ash Wednesday" remains to be seen.

---

[1] Casterman, Tournai, 40 francs per annum. [2] Paris, 15 rue Monsieur, 4 francs.

Auden is distinguished from some of his contemporaries by his refusal to accept the more obvious panaceas to ease the tension of living. Like Lawrence, he is intensely aware of the death-process within society, and—another similarity to Lawrence—part of his task is to reveal the havoc of this process. He does not conform to any political or social type. He is neither pacifist nor communist; a state of affairs which doesn't quite meet with Mr Spender's approval. For in discussing *On the Frontier*, Mr Spender states (in the above-mentioned article) that it " expresses two kinds of political creed, one pacifist, the other communist. This would not matter if the central aim of the drama was either the reconciliation of these two ideas or else the triumph of one over the other." But the author of that penetrating essay " The Good Life " (*Christianity and the Social Revolution*) is not likely to bind himself to the acceptance of any superficial alternative of the pacifist-communist variety, neither will he be content with an unhealthy synthesis of the two. Moreover, Ransom's vision in *The Ascent of F. 6* was " to conquer the Demon and then to save mankind," and whether we identify Auden with Ransom or not, it is true to say that, unlike some who seek salvation through politics, he does recognize the existence of Evil and of man's capacity for evil:

> True, Love finally is great
> Greater than all; but large the hate
> Far larger than Man can ever estimate.
> (*The Ascent of F. 6.*)

The April issue of *Blackfriars* contains a critical commentary on William Teeling's *Crisis for Christianity*, a book which discusses the present condition and future of the Roman Catholic Church in Germany. One interesting fact is stated which may not be generally known, that " Austria has suffered more from the religious persecution than any other part of the Reich."

Nov. H. Smith, S.S.M.

SURVEYS

(A) PHILOSOPHY

Among the many external signs of the suppression of freedom as it affects philosophy is the recent decision to transfer the Franz Brentano Institute from Prague. Its impending arrival at Oxford should make clearer to the English-speaking world the extent of Brentano's influence upon contemporary philosophy, an influence which would seem to have been seldom fully recognized in this country. Brentano was born in 1838 and died in 1917, and during his lifetime made a pervading impression upon all who came under the inspiration of his teaching at Würzburg, Vienna and elsewhere. Educated as a theologian and in due course ordained to the priesthood—though at an early date he renounced the exercise of his priestly functions—Brentano never lost his attachment to Scholastic Aristotelianism, and remained a consistent opponent of the " subjectivist " teaching (as he conceived it) of Kant and especially of Hegel. Among his pupils were Edmund Husserl and Alexius von Meinong, and it is quite clear that without Brentano Phenomenology would not have come to be, and that, in turn, without Phenomenology Logical Positivism would not have taken the form it has. It happened that Brentano published but little in his lifetime. Some of his MSS, however, have been published posthumously, and there is stated to be a large collection of them still awaiting the printer. It is said that the most important of them is an elaborate treatise on the metaphysics of theism, in which there is a thorough-going attempt to vindicate the cosmological argument for the being of God against Kant's criticisms of it.

The problem of sense perception continues to stimulate the keenest interest among contemporary philosophers; and even those who have little taste for the technicalities, if they enjoy precise discussion of philosophical issues in simple language, should not miss the paper on " How may phenomenalism be refuted ?" which Professor R. I. Aaron read to the Aristotelian Society on April 3. Without pretending to present any elaborated doctrine of his own, Professor Aaron raised some forcible objections to Mr Braithwaite's attempt to resolve propositions about material objects into a conjunction of hypotheticals. He urged that the criticisms which Professor G. F. Stout directed against Mr Braithwaite in his presidential address to the society last autumn failed to refute phenomenalism. Of especial value is his analysis of certain of the assumptions underlying contemporary epistemological discussion, notably the belief that what we are directly aware of in sense-perception is not the material object, but a sense-datum or sensum. Another point that he makes—which is really much more than a terminological one—is that pheno-

menalists have no right to use the word " phenomenalist " if the whole problem of perception can be resolved into their terms, since this word has meaning only in the context of the pair of opposites " phenomenal " and " noumenal." Professor Aaron also contributes a paper to the April issue of *Mind* on " Two Senses of the Word *Universal*." " By the word is sometimes meant a common quality of existing things and sometimes a concept " (p. 168). Much of the paper is taken up with showing that things in the natural world do in fact share certain qualities in common—*i.e.*, to establishing that universals in the first sense exist.

When the discussion of such colour-propositions as " red is more like orange than yellow " first entered into the consideration of the " material *a priori*," it does not seem very easy to discover. It certainly goes back to the phenomenologists, and was a stock instance with Husserl. But the prominence given to it in certain of Schlick's *Gesammelte Aufsätze* (a collection of essays published in 1938, of which several are written in English) has brought the nature of such propositions into the forefront of contemporary discussion on the subject of the *a priori*. In a much discussed paper which Mr Bertrand Russell read in 1936 to the Aristotelian Society on the " Limits of Empiricism," he used it to illustrate his contention that we can sometimes perceive facts about universals. If this position can be established, then one of the basic doctrines of the Logical Positivists must obviously go by the board. Mr Ayer takes up Mr Russell's challenge in a paper " On the Scope of Empirical Knowledge " which he read last year at the Fourth International Congress for the Unity of Science at Cambridge (Eng.) and has since published in *Erkenntnis*. He argues that whereas such a proposition as " turquoise blue is more like Prussian blue than it is like any shade of green " as a genuine analytic proposition is not dependent for its validity on any empirical *data*, the reverse is the case for such a one as " blue and green are more similar than blue and yellow." The latter " may be true," he says, " as a psychological generalisation, but I shall think it very odd if anyone claimed to know for certain that it was true. For I find no difficulty at all in imagining that there are people with whom the experiment would yield a different result " (p. 272). The reply seems to be that if such people really do exist (of course, people possessing limitations very different from those that attach to what is commonly meant by " colour-blindness " are here in question), then their existence no more invalidates the propositions under consideration than does the existence of savages who do not perceive that $7+5=12$ vitiate the *a priori* character of arithmetic. It need hardly be added that the great importance of the matter is that it is the thin edge of that wedge which divides positivists of all shades from conceding the possibility of metaphysics.

Before we leave the subject of " Modern Logic " there are

two books to which attention should be called. Mr Karl Britton's *Communication ; A Philosophical Study of Language* (Kegan Paul, 12s. 6d.) has much good discussion, including several illuminating sections on the non-informative uses of words—*e.g.*, as they are used in ethics and poetry. Fr I. M. Bochénski's *Nove Lezioni di Logica Simbolica* (Angelicum, Rome, lire 15) is an excellent student's manual, written as an introduction to Russell and Whitehead's *Principia Mathematica*. Unfortunately it does not deal with the ultra-logical issues about which some of those who do not read Polish are still awaiting instruction with eager expectation from the pen of a Polish Catholic, for it is rumoured that on the banks of the Vistula a school is in process of harmonizing the tenets of Logical Positivism with the principles of a Christian metaphysic. It may also be noted that another part of the *Encyclopædia of Unified Science* (No. 5: " Procedures of Empirical Science," by V. F. Lenzen, University of Chicago Press, $1.00) is to hand; and that the periodical *Erkenntnis*, which has recently been compelled to change its seat of publication from Leipzig to the Hague, is also about to change its name to *The Journal of Unified Science*. A good elementary account of Professor Carnap's doctrines will be found in *Nature*, May 13, 1939, under the heading "The Claims of Logical Positivism." The contributor is Mr Thomas Greenwood, who aptly remarks: "Without prejudicing the permanent logical interest of Logical Positivism, we cannot help thinking that the ultimate basis of its difficulties lies in its rather discouraging philosophical implications."

A book concerned with the relations between the *philosophia perennis* and Christianity in history that should certainly not be missed is Professor Nigel Abercrombie's *Saint Augustine and French Classical Thought* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 8s. 6d.). With brilliance of treatment it combines much original research and the promise of a great deal more. These essays make it clear that the extent to which French cultural life in the spacious days of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was permeated by St Augustine's influence has been too little appreciated hitherto; and it is brought out in some detail how not only Pascal, but also Descartes and, most surprisingly, Montaigne, were influenced by the Bishop of Hippo. But for those whose concerns are especially theological, perhaps the most interesting essay is the first, where St Augustine's early Dialogues are analysed in the context of the then prevalent Stoic and Neo-Platonist ideas. It is from every point of view a most delectable book. Professor Etienne Gilson has also recently published a fresh book on the relations between Christian philosophy and culture, entitled *The Unity of Philosophical Experience* ; but as it has already been reviewed in THEOLOGY, we refrain from discussing it again here. The present writer would merely add that he would agree with those

who, considering the eminence of its author, pronounce it a somewhat disappointing book.

Another book that certainly deserves the attention of those interested in the philosophy of religion is the late Professor J. L. Stocks's *Reason and Intuition, and other Essays* (Oxford University Press, 12s. 6d.). As Miss D. M. Emmet points out in the deserving tribute which she pays to its author, Stocks was an Aristotelian not only in the sense that he made important contributions to the study of Aristotle, but that his whole mental outlook was of Aristotle's cast. And it was the Aristotelian doctrine of the Four Causes in which he found the means whereby to overcome the dualism of matter and spirit which had vitiated thought since the Renaissance. The essays which make up this volume are marked by lucidity of argument and accuracy of expression, and are altogether free from technicalities; and more than half of them are concerned with the problems of politics and social ethics. It must be admitted, however, that from the theological standpoint they suffer from the absence of any adequate idea of the divine transcendence. If it be true, as is asserted on p. 43, that the object of our religious belief is " the whole world order," the inquirer who today considers that object might well come to the conclusion that religion was directed towards a very poor thing.

F. L. Cross.

(B) THE GENERAL SYNOD OF THE CHURCH OF IRELAND, 1939.

To attempt a *brief* survey of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland, which met in Dublin from Tuesday, May 9, to Friday, May 12, under the presidency of the new Primate of All Ireland, the Most Rev. J. A. F. Gregg, D.D., is to undertake a difficult task. Not for many years has a General Synod transacted so much business or dealt with measures of such importance for the whole Church.

" Synod Week " in Dublin has a character all its own; it is a great week in the Church's life, not only because " the Bishops, Clergy and People assemble to take counsel together in God's name for this Church," but also because the city is crowded with members of the Church who have come from all parts of the country to take part in the round of annual meetings, conferences and social gatherings arranged by the great missionary societies and other Church organizations. Throughout the week a full program of such meetings is carried out, and for many, especially for prominent members of the General Synod, the most exacting demands are made on physical and mental stamina.

The reproach, sometimes made, that the General Synod merely deals with business affairs and leaves on one side questions other than those connected with " serving tables " is scarcely justified if we take a glance at the agenda of the formal meetings of the Synod. There we learn that much time and attention are given to matters directly concerning the spiritual life of the Church. The Reports of the Missionary Council, the Home Reunion Committee, the Church of Ireland Home Mission Society, the Temperance and Social Welfare Society, the Board of Education and the Clergy Mobility Commission, to mention some of the items on the agenda, are all considered and approved year by year, and they all represent faithful and valuable work carried on in the day-to-day routine of the Church's life.

However, it is the duty of the General Synod to occupy itself with great matters of finance and administration too high for the ordinary churchman, who is content to leave such matters in the hands of the Church's elected representatives. If, therefore, there is of necessity emphasis on the business side of the Church's life at the formal meetings of the Synod, this is more than counterbalanced by the attention focused on the spiritual side at the meetings and conferences to which reference has already been made.

Among these mention may be made of the meetings for the clergy held each morning at 9 a.m. in Trinity College, where a paper is read and discussed. This year papers were read on " God and the World," " God and the State," and " God and the Church." These gatherings are among the most pleasant and profitable of the week, and since some ninety-five per cent. of the Irish clergy are graduates of Dublin University, the opportunity of revisiting Trinity College is one of which many gladly avail themselves.

Another feature of Synod Week is the great service held in St Patrick's Cathedral on the evening before the opening session. The service this year was broadcast and was one of the most impressive in recent years. It was attended by the primate, the Archbishop of Dublin and all the other diocesan bishops, with the exception of the Bishop of Down, who has been ill but is now, it is believed, well on the road to recovery. As the long procession came round the aisles, led by the choir singing the great twelfth-century hymn, " O what the joy," one's thoughts travelled back to last year's service and to the central figure in the procession on that occasion, Archbishop Godfrey Day, lately elected primate, but alas ! taken from the Church after five months' tenure of the position. The sermon this year was preached by Dr Forde Tichborne, Dr Day's successor in the see of Ossory.

Next day, after a celebration of the holy communion in Christ Church Cathedral, the General Synod met and heard the President's address. As one of the leading newspapers

said next day: "Dr Gregg signalized his elevation to the Primacy by one of the most important and memorable addresses that ever have been delivered in Christ Church Hall." His Grace's main theme was the decline in the Church's population in the south and west in the ten years 1926 to 1936, a decline amounting to some twelve per cent. (The total population of the Church of Ireland is just under half a million. Of these, about 194,000 live in the twenty-six counties of Eire, and about 300,000 live in Northern Ireland.) The archbishop's address has been printed elsewhere and has attracted attention all over the country. Having stated that different explanations had been offered for the decline in the Church's population, the primate went on to offer his own. One small community was living side by side with a larger community from which it differed in tradition and culture and, fundamentally, in religion. We dare not lose our identity and yet, unless we can effectively protect ourselves, we must decline. We must resist by all means in our power intermarrying, we must see to it that our religious observance corresponds with the religion whose reputation is entrusted to our keeping, and we must take all reasonable steps to check any further decline in numbers. These few sentences can scarcely do more than indicate the main theme of the primate's address, which made a deep impression on those who heard it.

Certainly the Church of Ireland has problems to face—depopulation in the south and west and crowded parishes in the north, to mention only two. One is tempted to ask, Will it be possible to maintain elaborate diocesan and parochial machinery in those parts of the country where our numbers have seriously declined? Whatever be the answer to that question, there is no doubt that the Church is well equipped with men and resources to meet new conditions. The spirit of the people is courageous and loyal, church attendance, especially in the south and west where numbers are small, is remarkably good, and the communicant life of the Church is maintained at a high level.

For the sake of those who are unacquainted with the constitution of the Irish Church something may here be said about the status of the General Synod. The Diocesan Synod of each diocese is a body responsible for the self-government of the diocese, but the chief legislative power in the Church is vested in the General Synod, which also is given "such administrative power as may be necessary for the Church, and consistent with its Episcopal Constitution." The 13 bishops, 216 representatives of the clergy and 432 of the laity, the clerical and lay members being elected triennially by the Diocesan Synods, constitute the General Synod. No alteration in the character or constitution of the Church is possible without the express sanction of the General Synod, voting, if it be

desired, by orders. However, the Church of Ireland has preserved a form of episcopal veto, since an adverse decision by two-thirds of the House of Bishops can render any act of the General Synod null and void.

The main business before the Synod this year, apart from the consideration of resolutions and the annual reports, was the discussion of four bills. The first and most important of these bills, that designed to make alterations in the elections of bishops, was passed into law and will be discussed below. The second bill, to establish a fund for the augmentation of widows' annuities, was also passed. The effect of this measure is that in future no widow of a deceased clergyman will receive less than £100 a year.

The third bill before the Synod sought to make new provisions for the guardianship and administration of the spiritualities during a vacancy in a see. In effect the bill would have taken away from the Cathedral Church of St Patrick, Dublin, a somewhat archaic, albeit jealously guarded right, to unite with Christ Church Cathedral in the Chapter of Dublin and so to make its voice heard in the appointment of a guardian of the spiritualities. The bill was referred to a committee, a result directly due to a speech made before the General Synod by Canon Purser Shortt, and no doubt indirectly to the efforts of Dr Luce, the Chancellor of St Patrick's, in whom the Cathedral has a doughty champion of its ancient rights and privileges.

The fourth bill, something of a hardy annual, bore the innocent title, "To amend Chapters I, II, III, IV and V of the Constitution of the Church of Ireland, 1934." This bill sought to bring it about that women should be capable of being elected to the General and Diocesan Synods and to certain offices in the Church. It was withdrawn and did not appear on the orders of the day at any meeting.

Something must now be said about the bill setting up a Board of Selectors to select a list of names for submission to a Synod of a vacant diocese from which the Synod may elect a bishop. This bill was carried, by a substantial majority of both orders—clerical and lay. It represents, therefore, the general feeling in the Church that the method of episcopal election which has obtained since the Disestablishment needed some amendment.

The effect of the bill is twofold. It makes new provisions for dealing with a vacancy in the primatial see, and it ensures that in future every diocese in the Church of Ireland will participate in the selection of a bishop of the Church.

A word may be said about each of these changes. First in regard to the primatial see of Armagh: hitherto when the see of Armagh became vacant the Synod of Armagh met and elected a bishop who bore the title of "Bishop-elect of Armagh."

But the Archbishop of Armagh, who is Primate of All Ireland, is elected by the bench of Bishops from their own number. When, therefore, the bishops had elected a primate, the Bishop-elect of Armagh went to that diocese from which the Bishop had been translated to the primacy, unless that diocese were Dublin. In the latter case the Archbishop of Dublin was elected by the joint Synods of Dublin, Glendalough and Kildare from the bench of Bishops and the " Bishop-elect of Armagh " went to the diocese thus rendered vacant. This complicated arrangement meant that some diocese had its bishop presented to it, someone, that is to say, who had not been chosen by itself and possibly one who would not have been chosen by the diocese. Now all this is swept away and a much more rational and convenient method has been devised. In future, the diocese of Armagh, when a vacancy occurs there, will send a clerical representative, elected for that purpose, to the meeting of the House of Bishops, at which the primate is chosen. There will be no " floating bishop," as the " Bishop-elect of Armagh " used to be popularly called, and no question of any diocese having a bishop elected for it by another diocese.

The second change ensures that, in future, at an episcopal election a Diocesan Synod will be restricted in its choice to the names on the select list, not less than four and not more than six. This list will be drawn up by a Board of Selectors whose constitution is laid down in the bill recently passed into law. Without going into details it may be noted that the Board will have clerical and lay representatives of each diocese in the Church of Ireland, the number of selectors elected by a particular diocese being greater when that diocese is vacant than when it is not vacant. There will be an equal number of clerical and lay representatives, and in addition the thirteen bishops will be members of the Board.

Now the effect of this change should be altogether beneficial to the Church, since, as stated above, it will ensure that the Church as a whole will have a say in the choice of a bishop. Further, it will give to the House of Bishops an opportunity of guiding the Church in the choice of bishops, which seems very appropriate in a Church as strongly attached to the episcopate as is the Church of Ireland. It seems likely, too, that this new provision, whereby a diocesan synod only votes on names selected by representatives of the whole Church, will mean that there will be fewer inconclusive elections than in the past. One other feature of interest in the recent legislation is that here, for the first time, provision is made for an equal number of clerical and lay representatives.

Nothing has been said in this survey of several important features of this year's General Synod—*e.g.*, the whole financial position of the Church, which was put before the Synod by Dr W. E. Thrift, Provost of Trinity College, who, as the Church's

" Chancellor of the Exchequer," continues to give the benefit of his counsel, and who has earned the confidence and gratitude of the whole Church of Ireland. No reference has been made either to the discussion in the Synod on the Report of the Board of Education or to the motion asking the government to inquire into the effects of the present policy with regard to the teaching of Irish and through Irish.

But perhaps enough has been said to show that this year's General Synod of the Church of Ireland, which completed the heaviest agenda of many years, has been " a patient, persevering, executive Synod."

R. R. Hartford.

The following books may be consulted:

The Constitution of the Church of Ireland, 1934. (Hodges and Figgis, Dublin.)

History of the Church of Ireland, Vol. III. Edited by W. Alison Phillips, Litt.D. Oxford University Press.

Episcopacy, Ancient and Modern. Edited by Claude Jenkins and K. D. McKenzie. Chapter on " Ireland," by A. H. McNeile. (S.P.C.K.)

Fifty Years of Disestablishment, by Bishop H. E. Patton, A.P.C.K. Dublin.

Hermathena, Vol. XXVIII, May, 1939. Article on " Custos Spiritualitatis Sede Vacante (Dublin) " by A. A. Luce, D.D., F.T.C.D. (Dublin University Press.)

BOOK REVIEWS

CATHEDRA PETRI. By P. Batiffol. Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris. 40 frs.

THE CHURCH UNIVERSAL AND THE SEE OF ROME. By H. E. Symonds, C.R. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

OMNIS ECCLESIA PETRI PROPINQUA. By W. Köhler. Carl Winter, Heidelberg. M. 2.70.

The books by Mgr Batiffol and Fr Symonds are alike in subject and in temper. Both disclaim controversy and attempt to discuss the problems of the early history of the Church of Rome in her relation to the rest of Christendom as historians seeking for truth and not proving a thesis. All who reverence the works of Mgr Batiffol will know what to expect, and we are glad to see that, while acknowledging his indebtedness to Batiffol's work in the same field, Fr Symonds follows him in severe critical detachment.

Cathedra Petri is a collection of hitherto unpublished essays and lectures, some given by Batiffol as far back as 1907. In addition to an introduction on the meaning of Catholicism and a sermon on the Church, the book consists of three sets of essays or lectures: the first discussing the historical development of papal *potestas*; the second, various primatial titles of the see of Rome; the third, the relations between the see of Rome and the Eastern Church.

When we turn to Fr Symonds, we find a similar series of elaborate notes on those aspects of the history of the see of Rome which bear on the development of papal authority. Each one of the chapters exhibits careful and wide reading as well as balanced judgment; it is true that there is not the detail of Batiffol, but in those cases where we have been able to check one against the other we are ready to accept Fr Symonds' conclusions as the fruit of careful consideration of available evidence.

As we read these two books we cannot but wonder whether now this ground has not been satisfactorily covered. Broadly speaking, there is little divergence between these two scholars in matters of historical fact. But an historian must sooner or later make judgments; and in judgments it is impossible to exclude other considerations.

Where Mgr Batiffol would see the germ of later infallibility, Fr Symonds sees no more than a recognition of primacy in gratitude for the almost consistent orthodoxy of the Roman Church. This is particularly noticeable in Fr Symonds's comments on the relations with the Eastern Church. He points out that the Church of Constantinople, though regretting schism

with Rome, never considered that by being in schism she was out of communion with the Catholic Church, and this is emphasized even in those cases when almost extravagant homage is paid to the dignity of the see of Peter.

As in another field fifty years ago Westcott and Hort settled on broad lines the text of the New Testament, so now we may hope the main historical facts about the see of Rome in her relation to the other sees of Christendom are agreed. We must, however, extend our field of inquiry.

Too often, in Roman and non-Roman works alike, it is assumed that after, say, the time of St Leo and St Gregory the Roman hegemony was accepted by the whole Church—at any rate, of the West—until the Conciliar movement and the Reformation. Fr Figgis,[1] in a little known essay, suggests that throughout the Middle Ages there was always a " non-Roman " party in the Church, and that it was only after the centralizing party gained the upper hand at Constance and still more at Trent, that the more specific Roman claims hardened into an autocracy that had its natural and logical consequences in the Vatican Decree of 1870. It would be of value if some medieval historians would direct their attention to this problem. The ground would then be further cleared for a consideration of the more theological aspects of the question of ecclesiastical authority. If Fr Symonds and some of Mgr Batiffol's pupils could extend their researches in this direction, fitting homage would be paid to the memory of a great Christian scholar who consecrated his life to the service of truth and the unity of the Church of Christ.

The brochure by Herr Köhler of Heidelberg deals with the interpretation of an obscure passage found in Tertullian. We must admit that the method by which Mgr Batiffol deals with the same passage seems to be more reasonable. It does not seem necessary to read into the phrase *Omnis ecclesia Petri propinqua* a reference to some obscure hero worship of pagan Greece. Herr Köhler treats us to a learned thesis which, however, appears to be singularly unconvincing. The simplest interpretation is nearly always the correct one.

H. E. Wynn.

Recusant Poets. By Louise Imogen Guiney. With a selection from their work. Vol. I: Saint Thomas More to Ben Jonson. Sheed and Ward. 18s.

This is the first volume of a work in which it is intended to present an anthology of verse written by Roman Catholic

---

[1] In a volume, *Our Place in Christendom*, by various authors, published by Longmans.

Recusants " from about the middle of the sixteenth to about the middle of the eighteenth century." The poems are arranged chronologically, and are grouped under the names of their authors, or under a heading such as " The Pilgrimage of Grace," " The Cause of Mary, Queen of Scots," etc., each group being preceded by a biographical and historical introduction.

Poems have been chosen, some for literary and some for historical reasons, whilst some again seem rather slender pegs on which to hang biographies of religious zeal. Most of the poets are perhaps too sparsely represented, and the use of brief extracts culled here and there from longer poems, adds to a general effect of scrappiness, which, however, could hardly be avoided without radically altering the scope and form of the book.

It is, nevertheless, a work of careful and exact scholarship, the product of a great many years' devoted study. The poems have been faithfully reproduced from the best manuscript or printed sources, and the historical matter is fully documented. Specialist students of the period will find new biographical data, and some interesting, if still conjectural, ascriptions of certain poems. The biographies of Henry Constable and William Alabaster are especially full and important, and we are promised a critical edition of the English sonnets of the latter. The ascription to Blessed Henry Walpole of " A Prisoner's Song " and " The Song of Mary the Mother of Christ " seems likely from internal as well as external evidence. It is a little ironical that both poems are to be found in the Parker Society reprints, as representative of the devotional poetry of the Reformation—especially as they have most of the marks of the Counter-reformation about them.

The extracts range through the hesitant, stumbling rhythms of popular pre-Elizabethan verse, into the accomplished metric and self-conscious " conceits " at the turn of the century; though only, I think, in Lodge do we find any shadow of Renaissance exuberance. The " conceited " style is natural to expressions of Christian doctrine, with its paradoxical union of God and man in one Person, and the Bread and Wine which can become the Body and Blood of Christ. Henry Constable in a sonnet, " To the Blessed Sacrament," compares the Host to the earthly body of our Lord:

> " thou seemest in thy syndon wrap't to bee
> lyke to a corse, whose monument I am,
> Buryed in me, unto my sowle appeare
> pryson'd in earth, and bannish't from thy syght,
> Lyke our forefathers, who in Lymbo were."

An extended conceit of this kind, with its careful intellectual parallelism, is closely related to the common practice of Donne. In the Jesuit writers, however, we find a type of conceit unlike

anything in Anglican devotional verse. Blessed Robert Southwell speaks of our Lord's eyes as he looks on Peter:

> " O Pooles of Hesebon, the bathes of grace,
> Where happy spirits dive in sweet desires."

Again, Blessed Henry Walpole speaks of heaven as

> " River of pleasure, sea of Delight
> garden of glorie ever greene."

The emotional rhythms are weakened by a vague generality in the descriptive terms: " sweet desires " clinches the suggestion of mystical " sublimation " of the erotic. In Southwell are the germs of all that we find in Crashaw later: the erotic imagery, special devotion to the infant Jesus and the physical sufferings of our Lord, the association of blood and tears, the cloying sweetness often so grossly misapplied—*e.g.*, the extract " Flowers of Heaven," where we read:

> " Life giving juice of living love, their sugred veines doth fill,
> And watred with eternall showers, they nectared drops distill."

Verse of this type comes out of the Jesuit endeavour to meet a new emotional situation with fresh emotional appeals: it is related to the post-Tridentine development of extra-liturgical services, the " gush " of contemporary books of devotions, and the Baroque in church decoration. Distrust of popery prevented Anglican contamination until the nineteenth century. After Southwell it is a relief to turn back to the grim simplicity of Thomas Vaux and to words which must have echoed in the mind of Shakespeare:

> " A pikeax and a spade,
> And eke a shrowdyng shete,
> A house of claye for to be made,
> for such a gest most mete."

Constable is well represented, and the specimens of Alabaster are most intriguing.

The general tone must, of course, be discounted. There is the usual suggestion of a golden age before the dissolution of the monasteries, whilst Queen Elizabeth figures as a very successful inversion of the Scarlet Woman. And is it not injudicious to dwell upon Topcliffe's tortures, in the heyday of the Inquisition ? We are no longer swayed by *Westward Ho !*: may we not be spared its obverse ? It is time that both Roman Catholics and Anglicans attained the self-critical maturity which would lead to better understanding.

S. L. Bethell.

Secondary Education: With Special Reference to Grammar Schools and Technical High Schools. Report of the Consultative Committee of the Board of Education. His Majesty's Stationery Office. 3s. 6d.

The Spens Report has been well described as the most important document published on secondary education since the Report of the Royal Commission of 1895. Valuable as the previous work of the Consultative Committee has been, this is their greatest achievement, as regards both the amount of useful material collected and digested and the constructive character of the proposals put forward. To the Secretary, Dr R. F. Young, is due not only the lucid exposition of which he is a master, but also some of the more valuable matter of the report; the account in Appendix II of the development of the conception of general liberal education is his, and one may safely attribute to him much of the substance of Chapter I, on the development of the traditional curriculum in secondary schools.

In a report of this kind, which is the work of a standing committee of such repute and has an official character even though the Board of Education does not commit itself to the recommendations, it is inevitable that there should be many statements and conclusions that are more unassailable than astonishing. For example, much of the chapter on the physical and mental characteristics of adolescence may seem to leave us more or less where we were before. But it would be unreasonable as well as ungenerous to complain on that account. Rather is it a matter of congratulation that, in addition to the chapters summarizing much essential material of an historical, administrative and technical nature, the report presents a clear and comprehensive program of educational reorganization and development.

The report recommends that all post-primary education (*i.e.*, after the age of eleven plus) should be brought into one system, with three main types of school available: (1) the Grammar School, which is a secondary school with the traditional academic bias and providing for pupils likely to proceed to the university; (2) the Technical High School, which is the type of school that the report is specially concerned to encourage, and which should provide a higher education with a technical bias in its more advanced stages for pupils to whom the academic curriculum is unsuitable; (3) the Modern School, selective and non-selective, which would correspond with Senior Elementary and Central Schools. Importance is attached to the achievement of a real parity between all types of secondary education, and concrete recommendations are made to that end. It is not altogether clear how the children are actually to be selected for these three types of school.

On the urgent question of the reform of the School Certificate Examination, the Report offers three main recommendations: (1) that matriculation should not be obtainable solely on the School Certificate, (2) that candidates should have greater freedom of choice between the different subjects of the examination, and (3) that there should be a reduction in the content of the examination syllabuses.

Readers of THEOLOGY will be mainly interested in the attitude of the Committee to religious education, and no apology is needed for giving this part of the report greater prominence in this review. Scripture (Chapter V) is given more space in the report than any other single school subject, and the recommendations follow more positive lines than any that have hitherto been officially issued. The report recognizes the recent growth of interest in religious education, inside and outside the teaching profession, indicated in particular by the general adoption of agreed syllabuses in elementary schools, by the demand from the schools for properly qualified teachers, and by the better provision of means whereby teachers can obtain the necessary equipment. The report goes on to explain the standpoint from which the Committee believe that the Scripture lesson should be treated. The approach proposed is " historical and objective, the temper and method of the teaching being such that the teacher's primary purpose will have been attained when he or she has made the pupil understand the meaning of the book which is being studied; and by ' meaning ' is to be understood the meaning, so far as it can be ascertained, for those who wrote the book and for those for whom it was written." Even with this amplification, the phrase " historical and objective " is easily misunderstood; and it is therefore very important to ascertain the meaning of the report as clearly as possible.

What the Committee's recommendations certainly do *not* mean is that the teacher should seek to escape the difficulties and responsibilities of his task by treating the subject as " mere literature " or " mere history." Every teacher of experience knows that such a treatment is incompatible with honesty and intelligence, and that religious problems force their way into the study of biblical literature for the simple and sufficient reason that the Bible is essentially the record of religious development. The Bible is indeed literature and history, but it is primarily religious literature and religious history. In the words of the report: " Theological conceptions are immediately involved in the explanation of the meaning conveyed by the words of the text to those to whom they were originally addressed, and in the questions which will be asked by intelligent and interested pupils." Moreover, the report goes further than this and recognizes that " no boy or girl can be counted as properly educated unless he or she has been made aware of the fact of the existence of a religious interpretation of life."

Thus the use of the word " objective " does not mean that " teachers of scripture should confine themselves to literary criticism and the provision of an ' historical ' background . . . nor . . . that they should not, themselves, have a strong sympathy with a religious interpretation of life. It can hardly be disputed that the best teacher is one whose interest in the subject and desire to teach it proceed from religious faith." " . . . in practice a teacher will often travel beyond the limits which we have seemed to define, if only in order to answer the questions naturally presented to him by his pupils."

It is fairly clear that what the Committee mean by the word " objective " is primarily that the Scripture lesson is the place for reasoned study of the material of religion, not for exhortation or devotion. Such an attitude in the Scripture lesson is not incompatible with a religious education which frankly aims at making children Christian, but is indeed a necessary part of such an education if religion is to be intelligent. " Scripture taught with this purpose in view is the best foundation for any other religious education given in the school." It follows that the teacher must do his utmost to present both sides of a question fairly and frankly. The problem here should not be thought of as peculiar to religious teaching; it is met with in other branches of the curriculum—in history and politics and even in science. In historical and political teaching it is usually referred to as the problem of " bias," and the first step towards its solution is to acknowledge that bias is inevitable—that it can only be avoided by omniscience, which is impossible, or by utter indifference, which is undesirable. The duty of the teacher, then, is not to be void of beliefs and opinions—he is all the better for having them; but it is his business to let his pupils know that it *is* opinion that he is expressing and that other people have different opinions. And it is the business of teacher and pupils together to cultivate honesty and seek knowledge.

From a consideration of the attitude to be adopted in handling the teaching of Scripture, the report goes on to recommendations on staffing. It is urged that, in every school large enough to justify the appointment, there should be a specialist teacher of Scripture. It is not suggested that the specialist should undertake all the teaching throughout the school; Form Masters and Form Mistresses who are interested in the subject should be encouraged to teach it, but the specialist should " act as the focus for the technical aspects of the subject . . . advise on syllabus, and . . . represent the academic seriousness of the study." Where it is not possible to appoint a specialist, there should at least be a member of the staff with strong subsidiary-subject qualifications for teaching Scripture.

The provision of means by which the teacher of Scripture may obtain suitable qualifications is the next main problem. The report refers with approval to the various facilities (vacation

courses and so on) that are now available, but it is worthy of remark that no reference is made to the possibilities in this connection of a General Honours Degree. There is scarcely enough demand at present to justify prospective teachers in taking Honours Degrees in theology only. At Oxford it is possible to take theology after Honour Moderations, and at Cambridge the two parts of the tripos can be in different subjects. But no equivalent facilities are available at the other universities, except through the General Honours Degree. Were the General Honours Degree universally adopted, it would be possible in all universities for intending teachers to take religious knowledge as one subject for the degree and at the same time to obtain a degree with Honours. Moreover, apart altogether from Scripture teaching, there is everything to be said in favour of a less narrowly academic training for teachers than is provided by the courses for Honours Degrees in one subject.

M. V. C. JEFFREYS.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

BURNS OATES AND WASHBOURNE: J. S. Cammack, S.J., *Moral Problems of Mental Defect* (7s. 6d.); F. H. Drinkwater, *Catechism Stories* (2s. 6d.); Sister A. Hardman, *Two English Carmelites* (7s. 6d.); Father James, *Where is Thy God?* (5s.); V. McNabb, *Joy in Believing* (5s.); Mother Mary Philip, *Companions of Mary Ward* (6s.); E. J. Sutcliffe, *A Two-Year Public Ministry* (7s. 6d.); Anskar Vonier, *The Human Soul* (6s.).

CLARENDON PRESS, OXFORD: G. A. Cooke, *The Prayer Book Psalter Revised* (4s. 6d.).

C. R. PRESS, ROSETTENVILLE, JOHANNESBURG: T. J. Savage, *How to Deal with Modern Misbelief and Unbelief*—a paper read to the Johannesburg Clerical Society (n.p.).

DENT: P. Goodman, *History of the Jews* (5s.).

EYRE AND SPOTTISWOODE: Allen Tate, *The Fathers* (7s. 6d.).

W. HEFFER AND SONS: E. Abbott, *Escape or Freedom?* (2s. 6d.).

INTER-VARSITY FELLOWSHIP: S. M. Zwemer, *Dynamic Christianity and the World Today* (2s. 6d.).

LONGMANS: E. C. Lee, *Christianity in Chains* (6s.).

J. C. B. MOHR, TÜBINGEN: G. Beer and K. Galling, *Exodus* (M.7.60).

MOWBRAYS: M. Donavan, *Nine O'clock Sermons* (3s. 6d.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: F. Gavin, *Seven Centuries of the Problem of Church and State* (9s.); E. M. Tillyard and C. S. Lewis, *The Personal Heresy* (6s.).

PHILIPSON AND GOLDER, CHESTER: M. R. Newbolt (Ed.), *John Steward's Memories* (Papers written by the late Bishop Steward of Melanesia, with an Introductory Memoir) (5s.).

S.C.M. PRESS: A. S. Nash (Ed.), *Education for Christian Marriage* (7s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: F. B. Flint, *After Trinity* (3s. 6d.); N. Hook, *Life: What must I think about it?* (1s.); R. H. Jack, *Pulpit, Lectern, and Study* (3s. 6d.); C. R. Poole, *Parochial Church Councils: A Guide for Secretaries* (1s.); H. B. Walters, *London Churches at the Reformation* (25s.).

INDEX TO VOLUME XXXVIII

JANUARY TO JUNE, 1939

PAGE

Adventure in Christian Unity, A Practical 368
American Theology, Some Trends in 65
Art Exhibitions (G. N. Walton) 158, 238, 317, 398
BALFOUR, R. E. 406
BELGION, MONTGOMERY 428
BELL, H. CHALMER 292
Biblical Theology 166
Blondel's Philosophy, M. 223
Books for the Clergy (Survey) 221

BOOKS REVIEWED:

Batiffol, *Cathedra Petri* (H. E. Wynn) 471
Bell, *Affirmations* (M. Belgion) 76
Boggis, *Down the Jordan in a Canoe* (G. Seaver) 237
Brooke, *A History of Europe* (C. H. S.) 305
Bull, *The Religious Vocation* (F. de Jonge) 395
Burnaby, *Amor Dei* (S. L. Greenslade) 313
Cirlot, *The Early Eucharist* (H. L. Franklin) 393
Clarke, *Church Builders of the Nineteenth Century* (N. Sykes) . . 304
Creed, *The Divinity of Jesus Christ* (A. M. Ramsey) . . . 70
Dodd, *History and the Gospel* (R. H. Lightfoot) 387
Farrell, *A Companion to the Summa* (A. Farrer) 153
Fitzgerald, *The Gospel to this Generation* (M. Armstrong) . . . 300
Flew, *Jesus and His Church* (J. A. Ramsbotham) 232
Gardner-Smith, *St. John and the Synoptic Gospels* (C. F. Evans) . 309
Gilson, *The Unity of Philosophical Experience* (W. W. S. March) . 311
Gorodetzky, *The Humiliated Christ* (J. D. C. Pellow) . . . 234
Guillaume, *Prophecy and Divination* (F. S. Marsh) 148
Guiney, *Recusant Poets* (S. L. Bethell) 472
Hebert, *Memorandum on Doctrinal Commission* (J. K. Mozley) . . 388
Hník, *The Philanthropic Motive in Christianity* (E. W. Edmonds) . 236
Hobhouse, *Selected Mystical Writings of William Law* (E. Underhill) . 154
Hofmann, *Philema Hagion* (W. L. Knox) 312
Horton, *Contemporary Continental Theology* (A. G. Hebert) . . 235
James, *Comparative Religion* (F. H. Smith) 298
Jenkins, *Frederick Denison Maurice* (E. H. Blakeney) . . . 79
Köhler, *Omnis Ecclesia Petri Propinqua* (H. E. Wynn) . . . 471
Laborde, *Problems in Modern Education* (R. G. Lunt) . . . 315
Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity* (W. K. Lowther Clarke) 152
Lewis, *Out of the Silent Planet* (E. L. Mascall) 303
Mackinnon, *The Origins of the Reformation* (B. Hamilton Thompson) 397
Macneice, *Modern Poetry* (A. Sampson) 302
Maritain, *True Humanism* (E. L. Mascall) 74
Montefiore and Loewe, *A Rabbinic Anthology* (C. W. Dugmore) . 149
Murry, *Studies in Keats* (M. Roberts) 392
Nygren, *Agape and Eros* (F. H. A. Micklewright) 306
Paget, *Henry Luke Paget* (A. A. Cock) 296
Quick, *Doctrines of the Creed* (G. W. H. Lampe) 299
Robeck, *The Christmas Crib* (G. N. Walton) 77
Roberts, *Mitre and Musket* (C. Smyth) 229
Rosenthal, *Judaism and Christianity* (W. L. Knox) 151
Secondary Education (M. V. C. Jeffreys) 475
Shorter Notices 316
Shropshire, *The Church and Primitive Peoples* (C. Martin) . . . 156
Sturge, *Cuthbert Tunstal* (B. Hamilton Thompson) 72
Symonds, *The Church Universal and the See of Rome* (H. E. Wynn) . 471

Censorship, On 428
CHESTER, K. E. 42
Christian and the Next War, The 53
Christian Social Movement and Theology, The 186
Christian Social Thought (Survey) 378
Christianity and the Imagination 446

PAGE

Christianity and the Public Schools 438
Church and State and Germany 140
Church and the Press, The 206
Church Assembly, The 122
Church History (Survey) 289
Church of Ireland, The General Synod of 465
COCKIN, F. A. 7, 221
Comment on Periodicals 58, 133, 218, 285, 375, 458
Correspondence 373, 457
CROSS, F. L. 61, 462
Culture and Conversion 107
DAVEY, F. N. 166
Doctrine (Survey) 136
Dogmatic Theology 246
ELLIOT, G. R. 446
EVERY, BRO. G., S.S.M. 176
Family Reunion, The, by T. S. Eliot (A. Sampson) 455
FARRER, AUSTIN 332
GRENSTED, L. W. 88
HARTFORD, R. R. 465
HARTILL, P. 122
HEYWOOD, H. C. L. 25, 113
HODGES, H. A. 322
HUNTER, L. S. 36
Hymns A. and M., The Beginnings of 276
Infant Baptism 361
Is Christianity a Product of Judaism? 131
James Woodforde in his Pulpit 97, 341
JARRETT-KERR, W. R. 107
Karl Barth and Democracy 216
KINGDON, H. P. 140
MACKINNON, D. M. 254, 378
MASCALL, E. L. 53
MAYFIELD, GUY 206
Moral Influence of Poetry, The 16
Moral Rearmament, The Meaning of 322
Nathanael Culverwel 196, 259
Necessity of Scrutiny, The 176
Need for Theology, The 7
PHILLIPS, C. S. 276
Philosophy (Survey) 61, 462
PITTENGER, W. NORMAN 65
Pius XI, The Policy of 406
Prayer and Theology 418
Problem of Luxury, The 25, 113
QUICK, O. C. 246
RICHARDSON, ALAN 136
ROBERTS, MICHAEL 16
Rumania, Religious Thought in 292
RUNGE, C. H. S., C.R. 382
Sacred Poem, A 268
Scope of Theology, The 88
SCUPHOLME, A. C. 196, 259
Sensuality and Substance 352
SHAW, GILBERT 418
SMYTH, CHARLES 438
Some Difficulties in the Teaching of Religion in Secondary Schools . . . 42
South Africa, The Church in 382
SYKES, N. 97, 289, 341
Theology of Morals, The 332
THOMSON, G. I. F. 368
TINDALL, FREDERICK 361
TRIBE, R., S.S.M. 186
Vexilla Regis 254
WILLIAMS, CHARLES 352
Worship of God and the Life of the People, The 36

Printed in Great Britain by Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher